DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 001 RC 019 838

AUTHOR Taylor, Jeffery
TITLE Fashioning Farmers: Ideology, Agricultural Knowledge and the Manitoba Farm Movement, 1890-1925.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-88977-084-0
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 170p.
AVAILABLE FROM Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan S4S 0A2, Canada ($18 Canadian).
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Agricultural Colleges; *Agricultural Education; Bureaucracy; Capitalism; Economics; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Farmers; Foreign Countries; Government Role; *Ideology; Postsecondary Education; *Rural Education; Rural Extension; Social Sciences; Social Structure
IDENTIFIERS *Agrarianism; Agricultural Economics; Agricultural History; *Manitoba

ABSTRACT

This book presents a study of educational institutions in Manitoba (Canada) agriculture before 1925, the dominant ideologies that resided there, and the impact of those ideologies on the agrarian movement. The first chapter overviews a variety of ideologies, state structures, and agrarian movements in North America during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. During this time, capitalist expansion, the development of a bureaucratic state, and the experience of working-class and women's movements in Manitoba were interrelated and contributed to divisions that developed during the 20th century. The second chapter outlines educational institutions in Manitoba agriculture during this period. Beginning in the 19th century, volunteer organizations such as agricultural societies and farmers' institutes were established for the production and transmission of agricultural knowledge. Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC) opened in 1905 and became the mainstay of agricultural education. Chapter 3 documents the internal evolution of MAC, relevant academic disciplines, agricultural education for children and youth, and rural adult education before and after the formation of an extension service. Chapters 4 and 5 analyze the theoretical and practical components of the dominant ideology including the emergence of rural social science disciplines such as agricultural economics, home economics, rural sociology, and rural education. Chapter 6 examines the context of the Manitoba agrarian movement, 1890-1925. This chapter addresses the tension between the dominant ideology and challenging popular ideologies such as the radicalism of the Patrons of Industry. The last chapter summarizes how dominant and critical elements interacted in the Manitoba experience. Contains over 350 references as well as 91 notes. (LP)

ED 376 001

Fashioning Farmers

Ideology, Agricultural Knowledge and the Manitoba Farm Movement, 1890-1925

Jeffery Taylor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian Mazgar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fashioning Farmers

Ideology, Agricultural Knowledge and the Manitoba Farm Movement, 1890-1925

Fashioning Farmers

Ideology, Agricultural Knowledge and the Manitoba Farm Movement, 1890-1925

Jeffery Taylor

Canadian Plains Research Center
University of Regina
1994

Copyright @ Canadian Plains Research Center

Copyright Notice

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyrights hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means — graphic, electronic or mechanical — without the prior written permission of the publisher. Any request for photocopying, recording, taping or information storage and retrieval systems of any part of this book shall be directed in writing to the Canadian Reprography Collective.

Canadian Plains Research Center
University of Regina
Regina, Saskatchewan S4S 0A2
Canada

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Taylor, Jeffery M., 1953-

Fashioning farmers

(Canadian plains studies, ISSN 0317-6290 ; 30)

Originally published as the author's thesis (Ph.D) - University of Manitoba, 1988.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-88977-084-0

1. Agricultural education - Manitoba - History.
2. Agriculturists - Education - Manitoba - History.
3. Agricultural colleges - Manitoba - History.
I. University of Regina. Canadian Plains Research Center. II. Title. III. Series.

S535.C2T29 1994 630.7'07127 C94-920204-5

Cover Design: Agnes Bray/Brian Mlazgar
Cover photos courtesy of: upper left: Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Collection, Saskatchewan Archives Board, R-A15129; upper right: Saskatchewan Archives Board, R-A4809; lower: Provincial Archives of Manitoba, University of Manitoba, Fort Garry site 36.

Printed and bound in Canada by
Hignell Printing Limited, Winnipeg, Manitoba

Printed on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments vi
One: Introduction 1
Two: Ideologies, Educational Institutions and Popular Resistance in Manitoba Agriculture: Historical and Theoretical Contexts 5
Production 5
Capitalist Industry 5
The Prairie Agricultural Economy 6
Domestic Labour in Working-Class and Farm Households 12
Prairie Farm Households and the Capitalist Economy 13
Ideologies, Institutions and the Creation of Identity 15
From Production to Identity 15
A Theory of Ideology 16
The Educational State 18
Class Resistance 21
Gender Resistance 24
Three: Public Educational Institutions in Manitoba Agriculture 27
The Legislative Framework of Agricultural Education 27
Manitoba Agricultural College: Administration and Staffing 30
Manitoba Agricultural College: Disciplinary Structures of Rural Social Science 36
Rural Adult Education 41
Agriculture in the Schools 44
Four: Theoretical Categories in the Dominant Ideology 48
Agricultural Economics 48
Home Economics 54
Rural Sociology 59
Rural Education 63
Five: The Practical Creation of Dominant Agrarian Identities 68
Men 68
Women 76
Children and Youth 82
Intellectuals 86
Six: The Language of Agrarianism 90
Oppositional Radicalism 90
Conservative Agrarianism 98
Residual Radicalism 105
Female Agrarianism 108
Seven: Conclusion 117
Endnotes 120
Bibliography 147

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people provided support of various kinds as I wrote this book. Gerry Friesen read numerous versions. Bill Brennan, Brian McKillop, Ed Rea, John Kendle and Paul Phillips read an earlier version. Alvin Finkel, Jim McCrorie and Ian MacPherson read a later version. Janice Williamson, Carol Anne O'Brien, Zenon Gawron and Gerry Friesen, among others, gave emotional support at various times. Comrades and colleagues at the University of Manitoba and at Athabasca University offered intellectual stimulation and friendship. And I have benefitted from the editorial assistance of Brian Mlazgar and Agnes Bray.

Research for this book was funded in part by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and by Athabasca University's Academic Research Fund. The final revisions were completed during leave provided by the President's Award for Research and Scholarly Excellence, Athabasca University. Portions of the book have appeared previously in *Labour/Le Travail*, *Manitoba History* and *Prairie Forum*.

Finally, this book is dedicated to my mother, Hazel Taylor, and to the memory of my father, Jack Taylor. Both were Manitoba farmers who instilled in me an appreciation of the rural prairie experience.

ONE

Introduction

What do we make of farmers? They have been described as radical and reactionary, as embracing modernity and being resistant to change. Many pages have been written by historians and other academic investigators trying to determine where farmers fit in industrial-capitalist societies. Are they capitalists? Are they noncapitalists? Is farming a business or is it a way of life? Some commentators come down on one or the other side of these questions. Others hedge their bets and say farmers are both capitalist and noncapitalist, depending on how and when they are observed, or that farming is both a business and a way of life. In this book I attempt to get beyond the binary oppositions and the essentialism that are implicit in these questions. I also try to transcend the gender neutrality that is present in much of the analysis. What I do here is assess how, in a specific time and place and through specific discourses, the identities of farm women and men were moulded.

What follows is a study of the educational institutions that developed in Manitoba agriculture before 1925, the dominant ideologies that resided there, and the impact of those ideologies on the agrarian movement. The broader, contextual questions that govern this investigation are: how and through what process have the limits on public debate come into existence, and what are the conditions for transcending those limits? More specifically, how is it that certain questions are asked and not others? How is it that some sets of assumptions guide political debate while others are absent? Why are agricultural constituencies mobilized on the basis of certain languages but not others? Are there specific identities that either account for or support the limits which exist? Are these identities fixed or malleable? I do not claim to address or to answer these questions here. My analysis, while conducted in the context of these broader questions, has a more limited objective. By focussing on the formative period, I chart the extent to which a dominant view of rural economy and society was consolidated in Manitoba, and how this affected existing agrarian languages that were critical of the prevailing order of things.

This book is informed by a number of historiographical sources. I draw on educational history in my assessment of the development of the Manitoba Agricultural College, the rural extension service and agricultural education in the schools. This part of the argument is influenced by the revisionist educational history of the past twenty years or so, notably Michael Katz and, more recently, authors such as Bruce Curtis and Clyde Barrow.[1] I am arguing that educational institutions exist as part of state structures with connections to material forces and, as such, are contested terrain in society. I am also doing intellectual history of a sort as I trace the history of rural social science in Manitoba, suggesting how the professionalization of social science in the context of the educational state placed limits on acceptable enquiry. Here I share an affinity with authors such as Mary Furner.[2]

This is also a history of agriculture and agrarian ideologies to the extent that I situate ideologies and the formation of identities in the material development of a rural economy and society. Here I find myself at odds with authors such as Paul Voisey who argue that prairie farmers, *a priori*, exhibited a business sense or a capitalist mentality.[3] And, by extension, I have difficulty with the American "new rural history" which charts the apparent "modernization" of rural society.[4] I have more affinity with American historians such as Jonathan Prude and Steven Hahn, but I find their usefulness limited in that they assess the place of agriculture in the transition to capitalism, and therefore reproduce a linear view of agrarian development which seems more appropriate to metropolitan than to peripheral societies.[5] My assessment of the changing form of agrarian ideologies, meanwhile, attempts to move beyond debates about populism and *petit-bourgeois* consciousness to assess the ways in which ideologies and identities are created in social institutions. Hence I find much of the prairie farm movement historiography to be either too reductionist, in that a direct correspondence between social position and ideas is assumed, or too idealist, in that material reality is held too much in abeyance.[6]

Furthermore, I venture into gender history when I identify the specific ways in which male and female agrarian identities were created in this period. Here I attempt to incorporate the insights of that feminist historiography which views gender as a category that is produced, modified and transformed in history, but which nonetheless is embedded in production and reproduction.[7] I therefore try to go beyond the existing literature on prairie farm women, which is either concerned with charting lived experience or assessing the relative strength of class or gender identity in their behaviour.[8]

Finally, this is prairie regional history, as I write in a tradition defined by the likes of Vernon Fowke, William Morton and Gerald Friesen. This influence is less evident than others, but is here to the extent that it is the questions that Fowke and Morton posed about the relationship between the prairie farm economy and Canadian political and economic structures that first drew me into this area and has kept me here.[9] Friesen's view of prairie historiography as a distinctive subdiscipline with valid and interesting questions, concerns and continuities anchored me in the mundane records of the Pilot Mound Women's Institute while the exotica of postmodernist feminism and neo-Marxism beckoned.[10]

Theoretically this book is influenced by the poststructuralist, feminist and regulationist critiques of historical materialism. The recent turmoil in social theory has tested many inherited explanations of historical change. For someone studying a peripheral society such as western Canada, where models of social change developed in other parts of the world are often less than helpful, these theoretical ruptures have been as fruitful as they have been challenging. I do continue to cling to totality, realism, historicism, a form of essentialism and other modernist habits. But the attention given to discourse and ideology in poststructuralism, the unsettling of apparently fixed categories in postmodernism, and the neo-Marxist reading of capitalist development in regulation theory all provide exciting points of departure for the historian interested in the ideas and public personae of farm men and women in early-twentieth-century Manitoba.

In practical terms this means that the focus of this study is the epistemological space between social identity and material existence. In the first part of chapter

one I sketch the material structure of prairie agriculture in relation to industrialization, highlighting the way in which capitalist production and labour organization influenced similar processes in noncapitalist agriculture and assessing the relationship of domestic work to both forms of production. I then quickly move to the story of ideological institutions in the creation of social identity — this is the heart of the monograph. By choosing the interpositions between materiality and identity for analysis, I am not arguing that texts and discourse precede or constitute society; rather, with my feet firmly planted on materialist ground, I am suggesting that the trail between the material and the ideal is long and winding, requiring careful navigation. We cannot, for example, "read" a *petit-bourgeois* or populist identity from the material or structural position of farmers. Furthermore, I am arguing that an appreciation of this space between materiality and identity is crucial in order to understand the voices of individual historical subjects. Indeed it is the institutions and discourses inhabiting this space that constitute those voices.

The book is organized as follows. First, the historical context is sketched through a survey of ideologies, state structures and agrarian movements in North America during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Western Canada's agricultural expansion is juxtaposed with central Canadian industrialization and the transformation of world wheat production in order to illustrate that these phenomena were integrally linked processes of capitalist development. An account is then given of the growth of bureaucratic state structures — particularly educational systems — which accompanied these material changes. Finally, the general contours of the agrarian, working-class and women's movements are sketched to illustrate the ideological cross-fertilization that occurred among these movements in the nineteenth century, and the divisions that developed within and between them in the twentieth century. As part of this discussion a conceptual framework for analyzing the place of ideology in prairie agriculture is proposed.

Second, focus moves from the general to the specific with an outline of educational institutions in Manitoba agriculture during the period. From the nineteenth century, but increasingly after the turn of the twentieth century, a provincial apparatus was established for the production and transmission of agricultural knowledge. In the 1890s this terrain was inhabited by agricultural societies and farmers' institutes, but the opening of Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC) in 1905 made that institution its centrepiece. Chapter three is a history of the internal evolution of MAC, the relevant academic disciplines, agricultural education for children and youth, and rural adult education before and after the formation of an extension service.

In chapters four and five the theoretical and practical components of dominant ideology are analyzed. This distinction, which comes from Althusser and is discussed in greater detail in chapter two, separates those aspects of ideology that form part of abstract, conceptual systems and those that are actually addressed to subjects in practical, everyday language. In chapter four the theoretical categories of a broadly conceived rural social science are discussed. Agricultural economics emerged in the context of the transition to marginalism in the parent discourse of bourgeois economics; home economics, too, was part of the marginal revolution, while also being influenced by scientific management. Rural sociology was a child of the new sociology of the late nineteenth century that rejected Social Darwinist

natural laws in favour of an investigatory and interventionist approach to the social world. And rural education, as part of a reform in school curricula and the "invention of adolescence," granted young people and the educational system a special place in the constitution and resolution of sociology's "rural social problem." After assessing the ways in which these fields of knowledge constructed a theoretical understanding of agriculture and rural society, my attention turns in chapter five to the practical language used to address Manitoba farm people in this ideology. Here I delineate the various elements in male, female and youth identity as they were created in and through MAC, the extension service and the public educational system. As I make this argument I acknowledge that I do not know with any certainty what was happening in the classroom or on the extension lecture circuit. Nonetheless, for the theoretical reasons discussed in the next chapter I do believe that inferences may be drawn about how identity was formed through language.

Having established the institutional, theoretical and practical components of dominant ideology, my focus shifts in chapter six to the language used in the Manitoba agrarian movement at the time. I begin by reconstructing the world view of the Patrons of Industry in the 1890s, showing that the Patrons employed a "radical" analysis which they shared with many other nineteenth-century movements. I then move to an account of popular ideology in the main, or men's, section of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the United Farmers of Manitoba, paying particular attention to the increasing authority of dominant categories on the one hand, and the declining presence of radical categories on the other. And finally, in an assessment of the language used in the Women's Grain Growers' Association and the United Farm Women of Manitoba, I note a radical influence from the "main" agrarian movement, a critical influence from feminism, and a dominant influence from the hegemonic ideology.

In the conclusion, I summarize how the dominant and critical elements interacted in the Manitoba experience.

TWO

Ideologies, Educational Institutions and Popular Resistance in Manitoba Agriculture: Historical and Theoretical Contexts

The educational institutions and popular movements that developed in Manitoba agriculture during this period were part of a broader historical process. In late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century North America, industrial capitalism matured in concert with the expansion of family farming. The societies thus created in the United States and in Canada, while dominated and defined by capitalism, were not purely capitalist.[1] More precisely, household wheat production grew within economies increasingly controlled by corporations, bureaucratic states emerged to assume responsibility for a range of previously family-based tasks, and popular politics was transformed. In the first part of this chapter I survey the relationship between capitalist industry, the prairie agricultural economy and domestic labour. I then move from production to institutions and movements to assess the way in which ideologies and identities are produced and created. Specifically, a theory of ideology is proposed and the histories of educational institutions and popular resistance in North America are surveyed.

PRODUCTION

Capitalist Industry[2]

In order to appreciate the dynamics of goods production in prairie farm households, we first need to understand the changes in goods production in those broader areas of the economy directly affected by industrialization. Canada experienced its first industrial revolution in the four decades after 1850. In the 1850s canal building began to give way to railway construction for the transport of staple products from the continental interior. With this impetus, coupled with a greater agrarian emphasis on market production, a home market emerged for both producer and consumer goods. On the basis of a labour market composed of skilled workers from Britain and the United States, and unskilled labourers from Ireland and the farms of Quebec and Ontario, both master artisans and former merchant capitalists expanded into factory-based industrial production. After the loss of the American market in the 1860s, central Canadian capitalists with links to Britain presided over the creation of a national economic and political entity that, it was envisioned, would be based upon industrial development protected by tariffs and serving an expanding agricultural population. Although the strategy was not successful as a national development policy until the end of the century, the 1880s witnessed respectable growth in the manufacture of producer and consumer goods. This growth helped expand the domestic market which, in turn, induced heightened competition and price declines. Employers, however, were limited in their ability to reduce costs since their control over the labour process

was circumscribed. Although production was increasingly centralized in this period, control of the pace and rhythm of work remained with the workers through their retention of artisanal methods. To be sure, a degree of division of labour took place in some industries, but generally workers continued to possess total knowledge of the production process.[3] This phase of capitalist production is called the *formal subordination of labour*.

The second industrial revolution, which transformed the metropolitan regions of global capitalism and spawned a new wave of imperialism in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, was based in Canada upon wheat exports, new chemical and electrical processes, and mining operations for minerals associated with the new processes. New industries employing these processes, such as automobiles, chemicals and electrical goods, developed rapidly during the period. These industries were largely controlled by the branch plants of giant American firms, which joined the new Canadian corporations, formed by indigenous mergers in areas such as agricultural implements and steel, in dominating the Canadian economy. The firms that succeeded in the merger movements of both the United States and Canada did so by cutting costs through the creation of internal economies. At one level, the simple application of large-scale technology produced these savings. More crucially, though, successful corporations were able to increase their economies of throughput; that is, they were able to maximize their output per unit of time. But this innovation was an organizational rather than a technical accomplishment. The flow of productive inputs and the distribution of production to increasingly extensive markets required coordination if economies were to be achieved. Hence a managerial structure was developed to control and coordinate factor markets, output markets and the production process.

The most significant production factor that needed to be controlled was labour. In theoretical terms, the *real subordination of labour* needed to be accomplished. Economies of throughput required the standardization and intensification of work processes. The new technologies embodied human skills in machines, and the professional engineers who designed and understood them became the new controllers of the production process. A new type of worker — the "semi-skilled" machine operative — was required to operate the new machine technology. These workers needed less skill and knowledge than the old craft workers who had controlled the pace of work and the resolution of production problems, but more skill than nineteenth-century labourers who sold little more than their physical capabilities. The newly devised personnel departments sought reliable, attentive and loyal employees who would obey management orders and not disrupt production. Managers, following F.W. Taylor's direction but not necessarily his precise method, devised various forms of hierarchical management systems to appropriate shop floor knowledge, to intensify work effort, and to speed up production. Although workers resisted these incursions in various ways, their ability to challenge the intensification of labour was limited by the expanding supply of immigrant labour that accompanied the expansion of wheat production on the Prairies.[4]

The Prairie Agricultural Economy

Prairie wheat production was organized in households. There are two types of household production in agriculture: peasant production and simple commodity

production. Peasants, while they may purchase and sell some products in the capitalist market, do not depend on the market for their livelihood. Such things as food, clothing, labour, credit and production tools are obtained through kin and community ties that are unaffected by the market. Simple commodity producers, meanwhile, depend on the capitalist market for the disposition of their produce and the purchase of all of their inputs other than labour. Labour, although it may be purchased occasionally, is normally supplied on a kin basis in simple commodity production, and this distinguishes it from capitalist production where all inputs, including labour, are supplied through the market.[5] There is a continuum, then, from peasant subsistence through simple commodity production to capitalist production. While peasants engage solely or primarily in subsistence, simple commodity producers and capitalists engage solely or primarily in commodity production. In these abstract terms, prairie farmers are best described as simple commodity producers rather than peasants or capitalists since, for the most part, they produced for the market using labour supplied through kinship ties rather than by the formal labour market.[6]

The prairie agricultural economy developed in a global context. Between 1870 and 1930 a world market in wheat emerged and was consolidated, the geographic frontiers of global wheat production expanded, and farm households displaced both capitalist and peasant enterprises as the primary form of wheat production in all regions of the world market.[7] This new world wheat market facilitated the emergence of farm households, but their expansion was dependent upon individual and varied state initiatives. The interaction of the market with state policies affecting the movement of labour and capital provided the basis for the transformation of production. When a world price for wheat came into existence, it combined with the actions of national policy makers to undermine capitalist and peasant production in the face of the rise of farm households.[8]

The world market in wheat emerged between 1873 and 1896. Before 1873 there were various markets, notably a European market and an American market, which, while connected by trade, were separate structures. After 1873, however, improvements in ocean and land transportation allowed the emergence of a market in which a single world price set the maximum cost of production in every exporting nation. The European price fell and the American (Chicago) price rose until they converged in 1882. But both prices fell sharply after 1882 due to declining inland (railroad expansion) and ocean (steamship overproduction) shipping costs, the new European requirement for hard wheat and, most importantly, a growth in the number of producers. This fall marked the beginning of a single world price. The price recovered between 1896 and World War I. After the war, however, there was a glut, followed by a period of high prices and, after 1925, a complete price collapse.[9] Whereas the fall of world prices before 1896 affected only European producers for the most part, the post-1925 crisis affected all wheat growers as even farmers were unable to meet their modest costs of production.

Although fifty million people left Europe between the 1870s and the 1930s, this did not constitute the formation of an international labour market. Unlike the situation in wheat, where a world price emerged, migration resulted from wage differentials among labour markets, or differences in standards of living between areas that did not have labour markets, and these differences were not reduced during the period. Rather, European emigration was organized through states

and corporations seeking to colonize new lands with farmers. The territorial expansions in the United States, Australia, Canada and, to a lesser extent, Argentina utilized farm settlement to effectively incorporate new areas into existing states. Wheat farming required the least financing and organization of any alternatives (other commodities; peasant, capitalist or other production) for incorporating new territory and governing it adequately. As farmers began to produce wheat for the market, the price fell. Any producers who were paying rent or wages, were tending too small a plot, or were unable to improve production techniques were put under pressure. Hence, peasant and capitalist producers became the victims of a world price that continued to fall as settlers worked themselves and their families as hard as possible in order to avoid proletarianization. Those peasants and agricultural workers who were forced off the land either pursued farming opportunities in the new lands, sought employment locally where wages were under a certain degree of upward pressure due to farm competition, or migrated to jobs in the new lands where wages were under even greater upward pressure from the farming alternative.

Nor was there an international market in capital during this period. Capital markets and rates of profit remained national phenomena. Capital did not move freely from one sector to another across state boundaries, but was induced by state guarantees that returns would be high and risks would be low. In 1913 England accounted for 40.9 percent of total foreign investments, with France and Germany controlling 20.4 percent and 13.2 percent respectively. The three countries held credits of $32.8 billion out of a world total of $44 billion. The bulk of French and German investments were in Europe, while half of English investments were within the Empire. Overall, the majority of investments were in the areas of new settlement where they had been attracted by local states for the building of expansionist infrastructure. Indeed, the largest portion of these latter investments were in the form of interest-bearing securities, such as government and railroad bonds.

In the areas of recent European settlement, then, states used wheat farming to expand into new territories. Wheat acreage in the United States Plains grew steadily throughout the period. Argentine growth began in the 1890s and stabilized from 1905 onwards. The year 1905 also marked the beginning of significant acreage expansion in Canada and Australia, with Australian acreage declining during the postwar period and into the Depression while Canada maintained growth well into the Depression. The fact that acreage expanded despite price movements stemmed from state policies of expansion whereby people who would otherwise have sold their labour power were given the opportunity to farm. (In Argentina, where private capital played a comparatively larger role, acreage responded more to price.) This new class became an important force in the various societies of which it was a part. It was much larger than the food requirements of the individual countries justified, producing for a world market which it had helped create. Most importantly though, by the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century, each society contained a class that, while brought into existence by capitalist expansion, was neither bourgeois nor proletarian.

Canadian expansion was not unique, then; it was merely the largest in this period in a global series of territorial incorporations into existing states and economies. But Canada's national policies, which included the purchase of Rupert's Land, the defeat of the Metis and Native inhabitants, railway construction,

settlement and tariffs, were noteworthy because of the scale of the project, and the speed and efficiency with which the preconditions of settlement were achieved. The absence of a settlement frontier between Upper Canada and the Western Interior, coupled with the beginning of wheat farming on the American Plains in the 1860s and the existing commercial links between Red River and St. Paul, presented a major challenge for the newly created state. Ironically, given the threat from the south, previous American experience in railroad engineering and the large-scale mobilization of capital made Canadian expansion a viable undertaking. Nonetheless, incorporation of this new territory was a major accomplishment because the Canadian government had to overcome geographic obstacles, Metis and Native resistance, and the north-south movement of commerce. The project only succeeded through subsidies and land grants, the protective tariff, special freight rates and an initial CPR monopoly. By 1885 an extensive infrastructure was in place, but it was only a shell of what was needed for a viable economy and society. Some settlement had begun, primarily along the woodlands at the edge of the Prairies, but there was no intensive network of branch lines and town sites to attract migrants such as had accompanied the piecemeal expansion of settlement south of the border. The massive immigration that did fill the Prairies in the early twentieth century (a fivefold increase in prairie population and a twelvefold increase in improved prairie land between 1901 and 1931), after the exhaustion of cheap American land, was composed of people induced by state and corporate coaxing, and largely displaced by global transformations in agriculture.[10]

The Canadian wheat market that developed in the context of this structure was marked by a series of contractions and expansions that generally reflected the changes at the world level. Prices declined from about $1.30 a bushel in 1882 to about $0.65 a bushel in 1896, while Canada's production increased from 32.3 million to 42.1 million bushels between the censuses of 1881 and 1891. With the boom that began in 1896, wheat prices rose to $0.75-$0.80 a bushel in 1907 and $1.20 a bushel in 1912. Production, which was 56 million bushels in 1901, expanded to 230 million in 1911. By 1913, however, with mortgage and other interest rates increasing as credit tightened in the London money markets, the price dropped to below a dollar a bushel, recovering slightly to a dollar the following year. And, reflecting a 25 percent drop in average yield per acre, production dropped substantially to 160 million bushels in 1914. With heightened wartime and postwar demand, the price increased from $1.28 in 1915 to an incredible peak of $3.15 per bushel in the summer of 1920. Furthermore, with state encouragement, wheat acreage increased by 80 percent, and the value of wheat and flour exports doubled between 1913 and 1919. Beginning in 1920, however, serious depression threatened as the price dropped to a low of $1.07 in 1924, placing extreme pressure on those producers who had incurred debt in purchasing land and machinery to take advantage of wartime and postwar prices. Perhaps because of this pressure, production continued to increase as it moved from 300 million to 395 million bushels between 1921 and 1925. The last period of comparative prosperity, before serious depression did become a reality, began with a sharp price increase to $1.68 in 1925, followed by a slow decline to $1.20 in 1929. Although prices were falling in the later 1920s, costs were low and crops were good, especially the record harvest of 567 million bushels in 1928 which increased Canada's share of the world market to 50 percent. The effects of drought began to be felt in 1929, however, as production fell to 305 million bushels, recovering to

420 million in 1930, but falling again to 321 million bushels in 1931. And price, finally, began its dramatic decline in 1930, dropping slowly to $1.00 during the year, dipping to $0.65 in 1931, and hitting bottom at $0.25 per bushel in 1932.[11]

These prices — terminal or "spot" prices at the Lakehead — were not, of course, the prices a prairie producer actually received for his grain. The spread between these prices and the "street" or "track" prices at the local elevator or siding was determined by an elaborate marketing structure variously presided over by capitalist, state and cooperative intermediaries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At the Lakehead, grain was mixed, cleaned, loaded and, after 1912, federally inspected at terminals owned by railway companies, grain companies, farmer-owned cooperatives and the federal government. The product moved by rail from country elevator through Winnipeg, where it was inspected (after 1886), to the Lakehead, with freight charges paid by the farmer at government regulated rates after 1897. At the local shipping point, normally a country elevator, the producer either sold his grain outright to a buyer, commissioned the selling or stored the grain for later sale. Whichever option he chose, and it was usually the first one, he entered into a commercial relationship with one of a number of elevator owners (or terminal owners if he had enough grain to load a car) who, for the most part, were grain and milling companies prior to 1910. By 1930, however, almost 40 percent of all country elevators were producer owned or controlled, with all transactions regulated by the Canada Grain Act (1912). The central institution in the grain trade was the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, formed in 1887. Comprising elevator companies, cash grain commission merchants and brokers, millers and maltsters, shippers, and exporters, the exchange set the various street, track and spot prices through both cash and (after 1904) futures markets. With the exception of the years 1917 to 1920, during which time exchange trading was suspended in order to halt an upward price movement and to ensure "stable" supplies to Britain and France, the open market system was freely operative until 1935.[12]

As the grain trade became established and the wheat economy expanded, farmers faced an increasingly corporate-organized industrial structure protected by tariff barriers and, after the initial homestead acquisition and preemption period, a fully capitalist market in land. Production inputs and items of personal consumption had to be purchased in the market. These included land and lumber for dwellings, barns and granaries; seed and machinery for seed bed preparation, seeding, haying, summerfallowing and threshing; household furnishings, clothing, and off-farm foodstuffs; and fencing materials and hand tools. With the flurry of mergers around 1910, which included fifty-eight amalgamations involving 275 firms in all areas of industrial activity from food and cotton processing to agricultural implements and iron and steel, businesses were able to exert greater control over prices and thereby increase their profits. At the level of the farm economy itself, the total market value of land, buildings, implements and livestock increased from $231 million in 1901 to $2.7 billion in 1931, peaking at $3.2 billion in 1921. Land (approximately 60 percent of the total) increased in total value from $129 million to $1.7 billion, or, on a per farm basis, from $3,343 in 1901 to $8,026 in 1921 and $5,955 in 1931. The actual price of land in the 1920s, meanwhile, ranged generally between $10 and $30 an acre, depending upon quality, location and the price of wheat. Total building and implement values increased from $46.2 million to $796.5 million in the thirty-year period. Per farm values increased from $850 in 1901 to $3,100 in 1921, falling back to $2,800 by 1931. Finally, the total value of livestock in-

creased very modestly from $54.3 million to $195 million in 1931, with per farm value increasing from $982 to $1,864 between 1901 and 1916, but actually declining below the 1901 level by $300 in 1931.[13]

From the initial settlement years, but especially after the expansion beginning in the 1890s, credit in one form or other was crucial to the operation of farm households. Land companies, trust companies, mortgage firms and private investors financed land transfers and purchases during the period. Interest rates ranged from 6 percent in periods when central Canadian and overseas capital was readily available to 15 to 20 percent in periods of contraction. Furthermore, western rates tended to be higher than eastern rates, and urban rates were generally lower than rural ones. According to the Saskatchewan Agricultural Credit Commission, over 80 percent of Saskatchewan farms were mortgaged in 1913, with an average mortgage indebtedness of $1,500 per farm or $5 an acre (when wheat production was returning $20 to $25 an acre per annum). In 1931, when the census began collecting information on farm mortgages, the data revealed that 35 to 40 percent of all farms were mortgaged, with an average mortgage per farm of $3,100 (about the price of a representative quarter section in the late 1920s when average farm size was two quarters). The financing of other instruments of production and consumption, including seasonal operations, was normally done through machinery manufacturers, implement dealers, wholesale houses and local retailers. These entities, in turn, were financed by commercial banks. Through a combination of banker-induced statutory limits on securities (neither farm real estate nor grain could be accepted as collateral) and a desire to invest in the safer, more liquid commercial and industrial fields, direct bank loans to farmers were rare. Where they did exist they were limited to three- or four-month terms, which were generally too short for either operating loans (since they fell due just before harvest) or machinery purchases (which required a number of years to pay off). Since it was unsecured, the credit farmers did receive through manufacturers and retailers was undoubtedly more expensive than mortgage money. Farm surveys from the late 1920s suggest that nonmortgage debt accounted for about 25 to 30 percent of a farmer's total debt load. State intervention, although it was sorely needed during this period simply to create a farm credit system, was minimal and, from the perspective of producers, ineffectual. The Dominion government amended the Bank Act in 1913 and 1915 to allow grain to be accepted as security, but banks were loath to significantly expand their involvement in the western farm economy. Provincially, war-induced ventures such as Manitoba's rural credit societies were dependent on loans from chartered banks which, after a few years of participation, demanded higher rates of interest and thereby scuttled the plan. By the end of the 1920s, prairie farmers had a total debt load of over $800 million, owed to a variety of institutions, and a ratio of debt to equity ranging anywhere from 3 percent on large farms to 110 percent on small operations.[14]

By the end of the 1920s, then, prairie agriculture was firmly established as a household-based economy producing commodities for international and national markets. Farm households purchased virtually all of their nondomestic inputs and sold virtually all of their produce in the capitalist market. This was the economic context in which prairie farmers conducted their affairs. But what about the domestic context in which farm women operated?

Domestic Labour in Working-Class and Farm Households

There are two sides to all production, namely the production of goods and the production of labour power. While some people (normally men) are involved in the production of goods, other people (normally women) are engaged in the work of providing subsistence for the goods producers and the rest of the household. In all class-based forms of production, subsistence provision is subordinated to goods production because the latter yields an economic surplus.[15] Capitalism, as a specific class-based form of production, inherited a sexual division of labour from earlier class societies.

North America's mid-nineteenth-century industrial transformation had a profound effect on emerging working-class households. The simple removal of much goods production from the household during early industrialization intensified the sexual division of labour by confining women more strictly to the domestic sphere. Some domestic processes, like textile manufacturing and shoemaking, were removed to the factory but, for the most part, women continued to produce goods and services for the home. Foodstuffs, clothing, medicines, meals, laundry and health care were produced and prepared in the home using traditional methods. During industrialization's second phase, however, the domestic labour process began to be transformed. Between 1890 and 1930 mass production and mass distribution brought new products and services, notably gas, electricity, running water, prepared foods, ready-made clothes, and factory-made furniture and utensils, to many homes. Standardized, uniform goods began to replace the production and maintenance work that filled women's days in the nineteenth century. The drudgery of women's work was beginning to disappear to some extent, but so was control of the work process. With the advent of the new technologies, the foundation was laid for the control of women by business through product design and advertising, while the increased productivity of domestic labour had an isolating effect since the labour of one person was generally sufficient to provide subsistence for a nuclear household. Moreover, while the amount of work required to maintain the family at nineteenth-century standards declined in the twentieth century, the new emphasis on consumption, social anxieties around childhood and adolescence, and, beginning in the 1920s, the individualization of transportation through the automobile were expanding responsibilities and producing a domestic form of speed-up.[16]

In theoretical terms, working-class households — as "sellers" of labour power — were competing with each other in the labour market as individual units (much like agricultural households do as sellers of agricultural products). Seeking to secure the optimum value for their product (labour power), they were forced to accept the dictates of the market and adjust their subsistence production in order to make their product (labour power) more competitive. In this way the market operated in working-class households to influence the form, duration and intensity of domestic labour. Market calculations were employed in order to minimize costs in combining the various elements of domestic work. Domestic labour was organized independent of the market but was really under its indirect control.[17]

In farm households a similar though more indirect process took place. During the mid-nineteenth century in central Canada the sexual division of labour defined the work that women and men did in farm households. As the industrial transition proceeded, however, certain domestic activities were commercialized,

with uneven and contradictory results for women. In some cases, such as fruits and vegetables, women's market participation was enhanced as their work did not change substantially as off-farm markets developed. In others, such as dairying, women's central role was gradually ceded to men as production shifted off-farm with the development of cheese factories and creameries. Men filled these off-farm industrial jobs and women's role in dairying declined. These gendered shifts in household activity were partly facilitated by the impact of industrial innovations on domestic work. Like working-class households, farm households were affected by changes in sectors such as textiles and shoemaking. For farm women, though, this meant a change rather than a decline in their work.[18] With the early-twentieth-century boom, meanwhile, women continued to combine limited market activities with their primary domestic reponsibilities. Furthermore, the shifts in mass production and consumption that were part of this transformation also affected farm women, but with uneven effects as a result of geography (the pattern of rural electrification, for example) and variable rates of incorporation into the market. Nonetheless, the domestic labour of farm women was changed in limited ways although, on the Prairies at least, the most significant changes in the post-World War I period may have been in those areas affecting geographic space, such as transportation and communications, rather than in the areas of housework and child care.[19]

Prairie Farm Households and the Capitalist Economy

Both sides of the noncapitalist agricultural household (the production of goods and the production of subsistence), then, were affected by changes in capitalist production and exchange. How, though, do we make sense of the relationship between capitalism and farm households?[20] By the 1850s, household agricultural production in most of North America (Quebec was a significant exception) was primarily market oriented and, therefore, dependent on commodity circulation. From earliest industrialization, agricultural households generated capital for industrial development and provided a market for industrial output. Furthermore, the geographic expansion of household agricultural production in tandem with industrial capitalism meant that the "vanguard" sector of Canadian and American industrialization (in contrast with the classical English pattern) was the "agro-industrial complex" producing farm machinery, tools and supplies, and processing agricultural raw materials. Agriculture became integrated with industry as labour productivity in agriculture increased, first through industrial revolution innovations such as the seed drill, the mechanical reaper and the steel plough. "These branches of production," says Charles Post of American agro-industry in the nineteenth century, "were characterised by both technical innovation in their labour process and either constituted or stimulated transformations" in other key branches of industry.[21] And, Michel Aglietta adds, American farm households were fully integrated into capitalist production by the end of the 1873-97 depression:

> This integration created a permanent tendency for labour productivity to rise in agriculture, and induced a major expansion in the output of agricultural equipment. There developed a strong tendency for farm prices to fall, settling at the minimum level required to provide sufficient money to maintain a farming family, plus the valorization of the capital lent by marketing firms and banks. The downturn in agricultural prices was in turn decisive in bringing about a fall in

> wages. It not only favoured accumulation in the department producing means of production; competition in agriculture also permitted the development of a powerful foodstuffs industry.[22]

Capitalist industry, in this period and in the subsequent period of corporate concentration, appropriated control of those elements of agricultural and domestic production that could be transferred out of agricultural households and into industrial settings; but geographic and natural characteristics of agricultural production circumscribed this extension of control: farm households remained more productive than capitalist firms for the raising of field crops and livestock.[23] Nonetheless, the agricultural household depended on capitalist industry for its factors of production and for consumption of some of its output, and on capitalist finance and commerce for credit and for the marketing of much of its output. This meant that, while farm households may have formally controlled their land, machinery, crops and livestock, they were sufficiently integrated into capitalist production and exchange to depend on capitalist institutions for their continued livelihood. By the early twentieth century, in other words, North American agricultural production was effectively under the control of business through mechanization, the use of credit, the supply of inputs, and the development and concentration of upstream infrastructure (*entrepôt* and processing firms).

North American farm households, then, were transformed in tandem with capitalist production. Beginning in the 1840s and 1850s, but greatly accelerating with western expansion and a second industrial revolution marked by new technologies and corporate concentration, farmers became subordinated to capital in general through the operation of credit and price in factory, goods and money markets. Equally important, and following the experience of working-class households, farm households were further subordinated to capitalist production and exchange through changes in domestic consumption. These two processes determined the material conditions of farming in the twentieth century.

By combining land, labour power and instruments of production in this context, farmers tried to maintain and possibly expand their incomes and enterprises. In this sense they seemed to act like capitalists. Yet, whereas the capitalist engaged in capital accumulation through the extraction of surplus value from waged labour, the farmer merely attempted to sustain himself in a production process effectively controlled by business.[24] Since business was able to appropriate the surplus from farmers through the integration of agricultural production with capitalist circulation, even the most successful farm management strategies produced only a modest expansion of their incomes and enterprises. Hence, any expansion that did take place was more akin to a worker's wage increase than a capitalist's enhanced profit. For the farm woman, meanwhile, the effective subordination of agricultural production led to the effective subordination of her domestic work.[25] Hence, the farm woman managed her household in the most efficient way possible. She was increasingly compelled to make calculations, alter the intensity or organization of her labour, and generally manage the domestic sphere of the household in conformity with the market. The two sides of the social antagonisms in agriculture were materially rooted here, in the subordination of domestic work (women) to agricultural production (men) and in the subordination of both to industry and commerce (businessmen).

IDEOLOGIES, INSTITUTIONS AND THE CREATION OF IDENTITY

From Production to Identity

The farm household in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was a double-sided production unit in which agricultural commodities and labour power were produced. Although the organization of the two productions was noncapitalist, they were both compelled through their subordination to capitalist production and exchange to obey the laws of the market. The overriding imperative of goods production (and the extraction of economic surplus) established a hierarchy in the household itself. The subordination of subsistence to the production of surplus provided the material basis for the subordination of women to men. This could take a particularly oppressive form in the case of farm households, where the male position of household head of the two productions was strengthened by the effects of the capitalist social division of labour.

But how do we move from material production to the creation of social and political identity? The question of base and superstructure is a source of ongoing difficulties, and theorists from Lukacs and Gramsci to Althusser and his critics have been concerned with it in one form or other. The putative debate between "(French) structuralism" and "(English) culturalism" for example, which was so important for historiography in the 1970s and 1980s, was really about overcoming economic determinism in our analysis of ideology and consciousness. As Seccombe has aptly suggested, however, the problem of determinism is not so much one of an emphasis on the base to the exclusion of the superstructure, but a serious narrowing of our understanding of the base. It is necessary, that is, to recognize the importance of consciousness and knowledge at the *centre* of production before moving to a theory of ideology and identity.[26]

In the case of capitalist production this means appreciating the social nature of the real subordination of labour. Real subordination has two elements. The first is the application of technology, which creates the potential for enhanced productivity by embodying human skill in more predictable nonhuman form. Since workers do not own the means of production, this involves an appropriation of knowledge from producers by nonproducers. The second is the intensification of work effort. In order for productivity to increase with the introduction of new technology, workers must at least maintain their previous pace of work. Since benefits do not accrue to workers, there is no immediate incentive for them to do so. Managerial supervision is required to compel workers to accept new technology and to work as close to capacity as possible. An owner of a firm thus attempts to extend control over the labour process through the appropriation of knowledge and the supervision of work. Workers, meanwhile, attempt to maintain control by setting their own pace, controlling the introduction of new technology, or claiming a share in the productivity gains by demanding higher wages. Hence, the point of production is the scene of ongoing struggle.[27]

In the two productions of the farm household nominal control of the labour process stays with the producers: farm women and men make their own domestic and farm management decisions. Nonetheless, indirect control must be exerted by business to ensure that work effort approximates work capacity, new technologies are introduced, and productivity gains associated with the introduction of new technologies accrue to industry and finance. Much of this control is

exerted through the price and credit system, where the labour of the farm household is assigned its value. But, given that control is indirect, the state plays a significant managerial role here. It regulates the relationship between farm households, on the one hand, and agriculturally oriented industry and commerce on the other. This includes, among other things, regulating social and natural knowledge about agriculture. Knowledge about the natural environment and about relationships between individuals and groups in society are both crucial elements of agricultural production. How it is organized, for what purpose and in whose interest become central questions in understanding the relationship between industry and agriculture, farm households and capitalism.

Hence, knowledge is central to both agricultural and industrial production and in both cases it is contested ground. It is, in other words, a material force. But more broadly, human knowledge is where we make sense of the social and natural world around us and where meaning is constituted. Antagonisms in production are more than struggles over control of knowledge as a material force. They also represent struggles over the production of knowledge itself, or the constitution of meaning. One's class and gender identities are anchored in this struggle, forming one's sense of place in and perception of production, and, ultimately, framing one's understanding of all social reality. The primary element in the distinction between material existence and consciousness is located in these two components of human knowledge. On the one hand, knowledge is material, giving human labour its uniqueness as a productive force. On the other hand, knowledge is the region of identity, which is not material in any sense, where meaning is produced. The two components should be kept analytically distinct, while recognizing that in any given historical moment they are joined. The problem, of course, is assessing the ways in which this connection operates, which requires a theory of ideology.

A Theory of Ideology

Ideology refers to the production and transformation of meaning, which occurs in the realm of ideas.[28] Although it moves far beyond it, ideology begins and ends with the production process, but it is neither merely a reflection of a material base nor in any sense material. There are two sides to production: the production of goods and the production of labour power. In turn, two components of ideology are connected directly to production: gender and class. We are constituted as workers, capitalists, women and men in order to take up places in production.[29] But how does the material relate to the ideal?

To begin with, following Gramsci, ideology should be seen as a contested social terrain, demanding constant organization and intervention by both dominant and subordinate social groups.[30] And, from feminist theory, gender ideologies intersect with class ideologies while following their own semi-autonomous path.[31] Furthermore, as culturalist and feminist historiography have shown, resistance to the forces of domination is organized in popular ideology and politics by subordinate subjects who play an active, determining role in the historical process.[32] But, taking account of Althusser's critique of Second International and Western Marxism, the epistemological distance between subject and object must be recognized. There is no direct relation between the social base and social identity; rather, as poststructuralist theory suggests, identity is shaped through intermediate languages and discourses.[33] It is here that ideologies are formed. But how are they formed?

Dominant ideologies direct people to their place in a mode or form of production and enable them to take up and perform productive roles. Minimally, a dominant ideology renders the inherent antagonisms in production as functional difference: women and men, workers and employers, are said to have different roles to perform. In postmanufactory capitalist societies, the state, particularly in its educative capacity, is the primary site for the organization and creation of dominant ideologies.[34] From the formal process of schooling to the less formal issuance of administrative decisions or the operation of commissions of enquiry, the state and state-supported institutions play a significant role in the distillation and refraction of knowledge. But these apparatuses are not simple reflections of the mode or form of production they seek to reproduce. Rather, the production of meaning follows its own particular form at some distance from material production. Specifically, there are two processes — one practical, the other theoretical — by which dominant ideologies are created in institutions.[35]

Practical ideology operates in the realm of people's everyday experiences, addressing them as individuals and as members of social collectivities. This is the process that Althusser describes as interpellation, whereby social identity is formed. The concept of interpellation assumes that ideologies are not received as something external by a fixed and unified subject. Rather, when an interpellative message is received, the receiver is participating in an ongoing social process of formation and reformation. It is here that we acquire our social identities, notably class and gender identities, and become *subjected* to a system or systems of representation. But in order to be effectively interpellative, practical ideology must be structured in such a way as to have resonance for those receiving it. It needs to connect with the experience of the receivers, ordering their world in a way that is meaningful. It plays on the contradictions in society, and openings and lapses in various ideologies, to coax and shape identity in a particular direction.

Theoretical ideology is where objects of knowledge are conceptually defined: it provides the epistemological space in which practical ideology may operate. Abstraction occurs here, in that the ordinary language of practical ideology is organized in terms of a specific and more precise theoretical discourse. First, a domain of knowledge is defined in relation to other discourses. Second, a theoretical framework is established.[36] Third, organizations are formed to shield the discourse in question from other discourses. And, fourth, restrictions (degrees, licenses, demands for "objectivity") are placed on who may speak and what may be discussed.[37] But the operation of any dominant theoretical ideology is ultimately limited by practical ideology or, more precisely, the interaction of practical ideologies with ideologies of resistance.

But how do ideologies of resistance — what I will call critical ideologies — develop? First, the production process is the material basis for the creation of critical ideologies. The antagonisms inherent in production are viewed as inequality or exploitation in critical ideology, although their source or form may be interpreted as residing outside of production. Second, the creation of a critical identity follows the same formative rules as does the creation of a dominated identity. Subordinate individuals are addressed as exploited and as potential agents of resistance and social change. A well articulated critical ideology, such as Marxism, has as sophisticated a discursive structure as the most fully developed dominant ideology. This includes a theoretical ideology, a practical ideology and, if it

has any hope of success, an institutional apparatus — such as a party — in which analysis may be conducted, ideology may be generated and the various levels may be linked. Less clearly articulated critical ideologies, such as populism, tend to exist more exclusively in the realm of practical ideology, drawing on a range of dominant and critical theoretical ideologies for categories of analysis. Nevertheless, these critical ideologies can and do form coherent critiques, fruitful languages for the creation of identities, and effective institutional structures.[38]

A critical ideology is, first and foremost, a linguistic unity, what Stedman Jones calls "a complex rhetoric binding together, in a systematic way, shared premises, analytical routines, strategic options and programmatic demands."[39] The specific relationship between words and sentences in the language structures reality in a way that has resonance for the audience in question. It is thereby able to mobilize a constituency by constructing a personal and collective identity in opposition to dominant ideologies. But its coherent structure notwithstanding, all ideology exists in history. In the face of changing realities and the emergence of new constituencies, the *malleability* of language is tested. The critical ideology must continue to interpret reality in a meaningful way or it will lose its ability to create identities and mobilize people. New or different social groups may appropriate aspects of the ideology, giving it new intonations.[40] More ominously, the categories and inferences of the critical ideology may be incorporated into the dominant ideology, transforming the former's meaning in the process. And the categories of dominant ideology may, in effect, infiltrate the critical ideology, constructing a new unity in which the previously resistant loses its critical edge and becomes accommodationist.

Class and gender identities are shaped by ideologies that are connected to production. But the ideologies are created, organized and transmitted through organizations that exist at some distance from production. The state plays a significant role in the creation and sustenance of dominant ideologies, and social and political movements, with a focus on the state, are instrumental in creating and sustaining critical ideologies. How, then, did these ideological and institutional forces affect farm people in late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century North America?

The Educational State

The transition to industrial capitalism in nineteenth-century North America was accompanied by the growth of state and parastate institutions. As they expanded and grew they gradually assumed responsibility for a variety of tasks that had previously been performed by families and voluntary organizations. From early to mid-century formal and specialized organizations with reformist purposes were created for the treatment of crime, poverty, ignorance, disease, mental illness and juvenile delinquency. Mental hospitals, school systems, reformatories and penitentiaries characteristically evolved through a two-stage process from private corporations controlled by wealthy citizens and staffed by generalists to publicly controlled bodies based upon expert and specialized administration. By the end of the century incipient bureaucratic state institutions were in place in North America which, while small by late-twentieth-century standards, were qualitatively different from the customary and informal methods of dealing with social and personal problems that existed prior to 1800.

The most significant element in this new apparatus was the development of state supported primary and secondary education. As the revisionist historiography of the past twenty years has shown, by the 1880s wealthy and middle-class elements in Ontario and other industrializing areas of North America had fashioned public, and ultimately compulsory, school systems out of the private and haphazard educational practices they inherited from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Faced with the perceived problems of crime and poverty, ethnic diversity through immigration, promoting "useful knowledge," unruly plebian/working-class and idle bourgeois youth, and training a proletariat in the rhythms of factory work, society's leaders regarded education as a means of encouraging and regulating the social changes associated with the development of capitalism. Not surprisingly, given the interaction between their size and purposes, these systems came to be structured and governed as large-scale bureaucracies. Educationalists and their supporters, confronting complex administrative problems on the one hand and the nepotism and uncertainties of the political process on the other, drew upon the capitalist model of work organization to rationalize, coordinate and make their schools function as effectively as possible. Like the factory, these systems were hierarchical and differentiated, combining an extensive division of labour with an authoritarian command structure. At the bottom were the legions of teachers, increasingly women at the primary level as the century progressed, who used only approved instructional materials in their classroom work and were trained in the appropriate pedagogies at Normal Schools. Immediately above the teachers, at the board level, were principals and superintendents who managed the local system and maintained contact with the elected board officials. At the state and provincial level, finally, departmental officials produced and dispensed curricular and administrative policy, while teams of inspectors ensured that central decisions were implemented and followed locally.[41]

One effect of state funding and the bureaucratization of education was the creation of conditions for the professionalization of teaching and, hence, the creation of a contradiction in the social identity of teachers. While bureaucracy undoubtedly involved a loss of control over the work process and a heightened exploitation of teachers as workers, it was accompanied by the establishment of specialist training, entrance requirements and an occupational association marking teachers as professionals. As a group, therefore, they seemed to straddle the boundary between proletarian and professional existence. This development was, in fact, part of a larger change in the latter half of the nineteenth century as the term "professional" came to be applied to a larger group of vocations than the traditional trio of doctors, lawyers and clergy. Rooted in, and based upon, the bourgeois values of achievement, ability and equality of opportunity, professionalism was a type of status acquired through the mastery of a specific area of knowledge. It was, at its core, an individualist philosophy focussing on personal development and enhancement through the pursuit of a career. Beginning in this period, various areas of knowledge were "professionalized" in North America when, characteristically, their leaders established educational qualifications requiring academic training, formed associations to shield the elect from the non-elect, started journals, fashioned specialist vocabularies and, in the case of academic professions, initiated the career-oriented production of endless publications. The central institution in the "culture of professionalism" was the modern university. Higher education in the later nineteenth century was in the early

stages of a transition from colleges dispensing religious and ethical instruction for the elite to large institutions reproducing the whole range of social and technical knowledge for use in a bourgeois society. Indeed the university was becoming a microcosm of that society, characterized as it was by "careerism, competition, the standardization of rules and the organization of hierarchies, [and] the obsession with growth and expansion."[42]

The professionalization of social knowledge, and its cloistering in universities, represented a narrowing of the boundaries of legitimate enquiry in the name of objectivity. As the histories of the American Social Science Association and the new professional organizations like the American Economics Association clearly reveal, an older tradition of general and reformist investigation gave way to specialized disciplines engaged in purportedly neutral, scientific research and teaching that was allegedly not tied in any way to a particular political or social project. What professionalism and objectivity meant in this context was a severing of any intellectual links with social forces — notably working-class and farm movements — that challenged, however mildly, the ascendancy of business and its values. American academics such as Richard Ely and Edward Ross quickly learned that their careers depended upon accepting and championing the dominant view of the social world. By the turn of the century it was clear to all aspiring American intellectuals that an academic career in social science meant that certain questions could not be asked and certain connections could not be made. Professional social science was slower to develop in Canada, but a similar though less dramatic pattern prevailed. In organizations such as the Civic Improvement League, established in 1915, social scientists worked with other academics, traditional professionals and businessmen in investigating social conditions. But the formation of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA) in 1913 hinted at a break with this general and reformist approach. It was not until the 1920s, however, with an expansion of social science education in the country's universities and the reorganization of the CPSA in 1929, that a professional orientation was firmly secured. By the 1930s, social scientists had established their authority as expert advisers to a liberal state. Although some intellectuals — such as those in the League for Social Reconstruction — aligned themselves with subordinate social groups, the limits of legitimate academic activism did not extend leftward beyond liberalism. When Frank Underhill tested those limits at the University of Toronto, for example, he was strongly rebuked by business and the state. Eugene Forsey, who pushed a bit harder, lost his position at McGill University.[43]

In engineering and the natural sciences the link between the university, capital, and science and technology was secured through the newly-dominant corporate capitalist form and the application of new technologies to the production process. The expansion of engineering education and the emergence of the professional engineer, in particular, proceeded in concert with the growth of national firms and, most importantly, the real subordination of labour in production. Engineers, as was noted earlier, filled many of the managerial posts in the corporate bureaucracies, and they were trained in the new universities.[44]

State funding and organization of agricultural education accompanied the expansion of public schooling and the transformation of higher education. Privately organized agricultural societies flourished in early-nineteenth-century North America as the primary method for the dissemination of agricultural knowledge,

giving way to government directed agricultural colleges and farmers' and women's institutes in the latter part of the century. North American higher education in agriculture effectively dates from the formation of Michigan Agricultural College in 1855. But it was not until after the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, which provided federal funding through land grants for agricultural and mechanical training, that a system of American agricultural colleges began to be established. The pattern that evolved was for funds to be applied either to private colleges (Rutgers in New Jersey) or, more commonly, state universities (Wisconsin) or state agricultural colleges (Iowa, North Dakota). In Canada, Ontario Agricultural College (Guelph) was established in 1880 as a publicly funded and, at least initially, unaffiliated institution. Although college growth was slow in the early years, systematic investigation in the agricultural sciences was established in the late nineteenth century, especially after the creation of a system of experimental stations in both countries in 1886. In the period after 1890, and especially after the turn of the century, state-funded agricultural colleges expanded and flourished across the continent, following the model of the new universities with which they were often associated. Intellectuals working in the institutions became increasingly professional, while administrators — most often members of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experimental Stations — increasingly applied business models to college organization.[45]

Farmers' institutes emerged in the late 1870s and early 1880s to supplement the efforts of agricultural societies in disseminating agricultural knowledge to farmers. Institutes expanded throughout North America during the 1880s and 1890s under the direction of agricultural colleges or boards/departments of agriculture. In these bodies both professional staff and working farmers conducted lecture programs in rural communities. With the expansion of colleges after the turn of the century, and the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in the United States and the Agricultural Instruction Act in Canada during 1914, systematic, fully staffed government extension services overtook farmers' institutes and agricultural societies as the primary forms of outreach and adult education. In both countries the groundwork for state-sponsored extension was laid by agro-industrial capital. The North Dakota example was representative. Railroad companies promoted agricultural improvements by providing funds for experimental stations and sponsoring "Better Farming Trains" to tour the state. Through its extension department, International Harvester established a 300-acre experimental farm at Grand Forks which passed to state control in 1914. In 1910, Minneapolis and St. Paul business interests — implement manufacturers, bankers, railway owners, processors, and lumber dealers — formed a "Better Farming Association" through which county agents were employed and boys camps were organized. This apparatus eventually passed to the state extension service, and the Better Farming Association provided a model for the state's Farm Bureau which developed later. By the 1920s, in states and provinces throughout North America, wide-ranging extension services employing county agents, home demonstration agents and specialists in various topics were offering instruction and service to farm women and men.[46]

Class Resistance

Working-class and agrarian critiques of business and the state in the nineteenth century were part of a tradition of popular analysis that dated from the

eighteenth century. The source of this tradition — at least in its plebian and democratic form — was the English and American radicalism that emerged in the 1770s, becoming coherent in the 1790s following the revolutionary successes in America, Ireland and France. As Stedman Jones has shown, radicalism — with its focus on political oppression and corruption — remained the determining mode of popular thought in England until at least the mid-nineteenth century. The misuse of political power was the cause of economic misery in this analysis. Similarly, early-nineteenth-century North American popular politics was guided by a radical ideology that was constituted from antimonopoly sentiments, equal rights beliefs, and a labour theory of value. The Working Men's parties and working-class locofocoism of the Jacksonian era employed a political analysis directed against the monopoly power of the monied interests. Furthermore, agrarian critiques of the Family Compact in Upper Canada were cast in terms of the deleterious effects of political corruption on the producing classes. The succession of popular movements that crossed the historical stage in the latter half of the nineteenth century stretched the radical, antimonopolist categories in an attempt to comprehend the reality of industrial capitalism. The National Labor Union in the 1860s, the Grange and Greenbackism in the 1870s, and the Single Tax and Nationalism in the 1880s all denounced political and economic oppression in similar terms, sharing a vision of society in which the toilers — workers and farmers — were exploited through the swindles and chicanery of the rich, particularly the "parasites' " control of the state.[47]

The impressive agrarian and working class mobilizations at the end of the nineteenth century were the last, and the most important, movements to employ radicalism in a coherent way. Eschewing a distinctively economic analysis of production relations, the Knights of Labor in the 1880s reacted to their loss of control over the pace and rhythm of work, and their increasingly subordinate place in their communities, by invoking the radical tradition in their demand for the abolition of the wage system. And North American agrarians in the Farmers' Alliance, the People's Party and the Patrons of Industry shared with the Knights an understanding of capitalist development that made sense of their common experience of exploitation. These movements began with a notion of equal rights and opposition to special privilege that fuelled their producerism, antimonopolism and cooperative vision. According to the Knights and agrarians, monopoly power, through its manipulation of the state, operated in the fields of railroads and communications, the tariff, the land, and money and banking, and a producer-directed government would bring coercive monopolies under popular control. Equally important, cooperation was the crucial corollary to state intervention in the radical project. In the agrarian vision the cooperative commonwealth could be established and sustained through producer and consumer organizations. For the Knights, the extent to which they opposed strikes was in fact an expression of their rejection of a conflict-ridden system foisted upon producers by nonproducers. At the heart of late-nineteenth-century radicalism, however, stood the three elements in the concept of producerism: labour was the source of all value, the wealth which labour created belonged to labour alone, and farmers and workers shared common cause in their struggle against nonproducers entrenched in the corporations and the state.[48]

In both the working-class and agrarian movements, radicalism gave way to divergent ideological strains during the twentieth century. Between 1895 and 1919

an evolutionary and reformist wing developed in Canadian working-class politics based upon the independent labour candidacies of the 1880s and rooted in craft unionism. Known to historians as labourism, and represented by such figures as A.W. Puttee of Winnipeg, it involved supporting candidates who endorsed policies that trade unionists demanded or who were simply from the ranks of the working class themselves. A program centred in the Trades and Labor Congress, and finding partisan expression in local Labor parties, included free compulsory education, an eight-hour work day, a minimum wage, extension of the franchise, and public ownership of utilities among its proposals. With a commitment to the politics of the ballot box as a supplement to trade-union struggle over wages and working conditions, labourism laid the ideological foundations for the working-class element in the social democracy of the CCF. Meanwhile, two revolutionary perspectives developed to the left of labourism during the same period. On the one hand, workers applied an explicitly Marxist analysis to their experience in political parties such as the Socialist Party of Canada (SPC) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP), concluding that the overthrow of capitalism through the capture of the bourgeois state was both necessary and inevitable. In syndicalist organizations such as the Industrial Workers of the World, on the other hand, political strategies focussing on the state were rejected in favour of strike action and struggle at the point of production as the key to capital's demise. After the defeat of 1919 many revolutionaries, particularly from the SPC and SDP, moved into the newly formed Communist Party.[49]

A different and comparatively conservative configuration developed in the North American farm movements. Between the demise of Populism and the organization of the American Farm Bureau Federation in the United States, and between the decline of Patronism and the formation of the Progressive Party in Canada, a clearly probourgeois perspective was forged in North American agrarianism. In both countries, as rural social science erected boundaries delineating the various regions of social life and as radicalism proved to be unable to challenge the dominant ideology, the economic and political became discrete areas of endeavour defined from above. Across the continent farm organizations turned their attention to the business of marketing with, for example, the incorporation of the Equity Co-operative Exchange of St. Paul in 1911 and the launching of the Grain Growers' Grain Company of Winnipeg in 1907. Although business perceived these challenges as a threat, and farmers used radical language to justify them, the marketing agencies nevertheless represented an adjustment to the apparently permanent reality of the capitalist economy. Politically, the elements that came together as the American Farm Bureau in 1919, out of a network mobilized by the newly created county agent system, championed farmer cooperation with business in the interests of making the economy work more efficiently for "all business" (farm and otherwise). In Canada, the group around United Grain Growers, and in the mainstream of the Progressive Party, sought an alliance with capital's reform wing in order to secure fair treatment for the agricultural sector in a political economy increasingly dominated by industry and finance. By the 1920s this tendency effectively controlled farm politics and economics across North America, but not without having had to confront a significant challenge from the left.[50]

While this conservative ideology was being created in the first three decades of the century, protosocialist and socialist agrarian movements were sustaining,

deepening and transforming the oppositional potential of radicalism. Indeed in many areas, such as the American southwest, parts of the American midwest, Alberta and Saskatchewan, this critical perspective was firmly entrenched. In the southwest the Socialist Party was able to create a substantial following among poorer farmers, sharecroppers, tenants and agricultural workers by building upon the Alliance and Populist inheritance and sharpening the producerist critique of monopoly to stress capitalist exploitation. The party also won significant support in the midwest. It had a particularly strong following in North Dakota, but here the educational foundation laid by party activists was appropriated by the Nonpartisan League which, by reverting to a more explicitly radical language, was able to form a protosocialist movement within the shell of the Republican Party and elect a progressive government in the state. Although the government was short-lived — defeated by a coalition of regional capital, urban middle-class elements and the state Farm Bureau — it was the most significant socialist success in the early-twentieth-century United States. Furthermore, by keeping the tradition alive, it ensured substantial support for the Communist Party among midwestern farmers in the 1920s and 1930s. Left agrarianism in Canada, meanwhile, emerged as an identifiable entity in the 1920s out of the progressive wing of the farm movement. In the Ontario and prairie movements a radical critique had been kept alive, while the mainstream moved into alignment with business. After the war this critique became increasingly socialist, gaining organizational expression in the Farmers' Union of Canada during the campaign for compulsory pools. By the late 1920s and early 1930s the Farmers' Union had spawned two socialist perspectives on Canadian agriculture. On the one hand, the Communist Party, through the Farmers' Unity League, was applying a Marxist analysis that, despite creative attempts by some to adapt historical materialism to the realities of rural North America, was rigid and doctrinaire. On the other hand, the CCF was evolving a more flexible approach which eventually succumbed to the accommodationist dynamics of social democracy.[51]

Gender Resistance

The independent women's movement that emerged in the last three decades of the nineteenth century in North America created organizational and ideological space for women separate from both dominant and subordinate male institutions. A distinctive gender identity was formed in the period which, while never completely transcending the boundaries of class, cannot be understood by simply referring to the putative class location of the women involved. Urban women, asserting their right to work outside the home, created autonomous clubs and societies in which to share experiences and lay the foundation for expanding their opportunities in the public sphere. With an underlying commitment to a woman's right to engage in extra-domestic, "productive" labour, clubs such as the Toronto Women's Literary Society were theoretically open to all women although, practically speaking, they tended to be the preserve of individuals from middle-class backgrounds. In ventures such as the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in the United States, however, important efforts were made to span the class divide. Among rural women, meanwhile, an autonomous sisterhood was built through the temperance crusade. After its founding in 1874, the Women's Christian Temperance Union became the vehicle through which women mobilized their power in hopes of changing an immoral masculine world. The most militant

supporters, who were concentrated in the countryside, viewed the ban on drink as the centerpiece of a larger reform project that extended to the suffrage, labour and agrarian movements. Indeed there was significant continuity between the women's movement generally and the radical movements of the period. In groups ranging from Bellamyite Nationalist Clubs to the Knights of Labor and Populism, feminists combined an image of woman as productive worker and social purifier with the radical philosophy of producerism and antimonopolism to produce a powerful critique of the male capitalist order. In various speeches and tracts from the period a social transformation was envisaged in which women built pan-class sisterhood, and then used their collective power to defeat corrupted monopoly and build the cooperative commonwealth of producers. In this way radicalism was fused with the feminist critique, while the liberating potential of the women's movement was firmly grounded in the radical analysis of politics and society.[52]

For the most part, however, the Canadian women's movement went in an opposite direction. The image of the "new woman" was a contradictory one that had both a progressive and a conservative edge. Women were questioning their privatized sexual subordination and demanding equal status in the public sphere, but the challenge was cast in terms of motherly duties and social housekeeping. Suffrage, which became the primary focus for women activists by the early twentieth century, changed from its initial association with progressive reform in the Canadian Women's Suffrage Association to a predominantly conservative cause by the time the first successes were recorded during World War I. The movement became controlled by professionalizing women (and men) at a time when, as was noted earlier, the limits of legitimate professional activity were becoming circumscribed. Professional women, drawing upon both elements in the new womanhood, created a place for themselves as experts in those areas, such as teaching, nursing and social work, for which they were believed to be best suited. The suffrage movement, under their tutelage, became constrained within a limited reform agenda defined by, and connected to, their professional work. Their reform initiatives and suffrage aspirations were legitimized, in turn, with reference to women's maternal responsibilities in the public sphere. Whereas some women linked the purifying and moral crusade of feminism to the radical language of popular movements, others used it as a vehicle to enter and bolster the ideology of professionalism.[53]

Canadian working-class organizations remained largely aloof from the suffrage movement during the early twentieth century. Labourite women and men supported enfranchisement, but as part of their larger, electorally focussed reform project. From this perspective, female suffrage was a means of substantially increasing the prospects of electing working-class representatives, and thereby enhancing the possibility of having the labour program implemented. And in labourite groups such as the Women's Labour League, which advocated union organization among working women, suffrage was promoted as a means of achieving equal pay for equal work and as a useful organizing tool in raising political consciousness. Labour women viewed their experience in class rather than gender terms, and were skeptical of suffragist aspirations to speak for all women. They preferred to work in their own class organizations in pursuit of primarily class objectives that did not challenge prevailing gender identities other than to affirm a woman's rights to fair wages and working conditions if, and when, she found herself in paid employment.

Similarly, gender was less important than class to socialist women for whom the struggle against capitalism was the fundamental issue. In the Socialist Party of Canada, with its aversion to any and all "reformist" tendencies which drew working-class attention away from the class struggle, the necessity and desirability of even minimal organizational or ideological autonomy for women was denied. The more flexible Social Democratic Party allowed space for the formation of women's groups and the discussion of reforms of particular interest to women, but a gender analysis never emerged to complement class analysis. In fact, throughout the socialist movement, and in common with working-class politics as a whole, the "woman question" was cast in terms that assumed the primacy of domestic roles and female subordination within the family. Women might fight for socialism alongside men, and a socialist future might promise women an end to wage exploitation, but it also contained a domestic vision — which most socialist women embraced — of an idealized working-class family saved from capitalist erosion.[54]

In Canadian agrarian organizations, too, the suffrage movement was perceived as a distant force which did not address the class realities of farm women. Like the labourites, the prairie grain grower associations were early supporters of women's enfranchisement. There was, however, little formal contact between the farm movement and suffrage societies. The Saskatchewan Women's Grain Growers' Association (formed in 1913) played an early leadership role in the movement for suffrage in the province, but the momentum soon shifted to middle-class professionals in the cities and towns who gained control of the Saskatchewan Provincial Equal Franchise Board. In fact, two provincial farm women's sections were not formed until after the real battles for the vote had been fought. The United Farm Women of Ontario and the Manitoba Women's Grain Growers' Association came into existence in a political atmosphere in which women were able to participate fully in elections, and these groups felt that a significant part of their work consisted of educating women to use the ballot effectively. For all farm movement women in the early twentieth century effective use of the ballot meant, first and foremost, supporting the agrarian reform agenda. Echoing the sentiments of labour and socialist women, class was more important to them than gender. They did feel that women had special concerns and sensibilities, but they believed more strongly that they and their men were engaged in a common struggle which overrode any apparent interclass bonds of sisterhood. While the organization of women's groups in farm organizations cannot be understood without reference to the late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century autonomous women's movement, then, female agrarianism owes more to the history of popular insurgency than it does to feminism.[55]

This broader historical context suggests that capitalist expansion, the development of a bureaucratic state, and the experience of social movements in Manitoba should be understood as part of one piece. The political economy of agriculture and rural social movements were integrally linked to industrialization and urban organizations. Capitalist production and exchange came to dominate farm households in this period, even as household production expanded; furthermore, the public institutions accompanying capitalist development were adapted for the subordination of farm households and farm people. My detailed investigation of aspects of this process begins in the next chapter with a survey of the educational institutions in Manitoba agriculture between 1890 and 1925.

THREE

Public Educational Institutions in Manitoba Agriculture

The public educational institutions that developed in Manitoba agriculture before 1925 were part of the broader North American pattern during this period. Voluntarist organizations such as agricultural societies and farmers' institutes were founded in the province during the late nineteenth century, providing a local forum for discussing agricultural issues and improving agricultural techniques. These organizations were incorporated into a more formal structure after the turn of the century with the opening of the Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC) and the formation of a rural extension service. The administrative and disciplinary structures that evolved in the college followed the general North American pattern and established the institutional apparatus required for teaching and research in agriculture. The provincial extension service created a framework for rural adult education, bringing the college and farm people closer together. In the primary and secondary school system, meanwhile, agricultural education found a place in the curriculum and rural schools were allotted a special place in this institutional ensemble. Through these various institutions the foundation was laid for the systematic creation and transmission of agricultural knowledge in Manitoba.

The Legislative Framework of Agricultural Education

At Confederation the control and direction of agriculture was divided between the Dominion and provincial governments. Before 1867 all aspects of agriculture had fallen under the jurisdiction of the various British North American provinces. Each of the provinces had developed central boards to supervise agricultural societies and administer annual grants-in-aid. The Canadas, however, had also formed a bureau of agriculture in 1852, which became a separate department of agriculture in 1862. Although the statutory purpose of the department was to create a closer connection between agricultural activities and the legislature, its main function became the promotion of immigration and colonization. In this the department proved to be a model for the post-Confederation Dominion Department of Agriculture.

In the division of powers at 1867 the Dominion Department of Agriculture, as part of a central state apparatus designed to promote commercial activity, was given responsibility for agriculture and immigration. Purely local affairs were left to the provincial governments. In practice, this meant that the Dominion was engaged in the promotion of "agricultural commerce and finance ... [and] opportunities for the profitable servicing of a rapidly expanding agricultural frontier."[1] Although the British North America Act gave the provinces the power to promote immigration and settlement within their own jurisdictions, in effect their activity was increasingly confined to the supervision of boards and societies and the promotion of agricultural improvement through various forms of agricultural education.

The artificiality of the distinction between commercial and local activity, as expressed in the division of powers, was reflected in various federal government interventions in the area of agricultural improvement and education. The first of these was the experimental farm system, launched in the context of the North-West's failure to attract immigrants and stimulate national economic activity. A House of Commons select committee was appointed in 1884 to enquire into the encouragement and development of agriculture in Canada. Convinced that wasteful farming methods were hindrances to agricultural progress, the committee recommended the establishment of a Bureau of Information and a system of experimental farms. Although various forms of experimental, model, demonstration and school farms had been proposed by committees throughout the nineteenth century without result, the government was prepared to establish some type of system in the 1880s in order to stimulate western development. In 1886 An Act Respecting Experimental Farm Stations was presented to Parliament to facilitate the establishment of a central experimental farm in Ottawa and four branch farms (including one in Brandon) that would conduct agricultural experiments and make the results of experimentation available through publications. With this significant gesture, then, the Dominion government first intervened in the area of agricultural research and education.[2]

Over the next twenty-five years the Dominion's educational activities were confined to experimental farm work, conducting dairy schools and establishing model creameries. In the second decade of the twentieth century, however, the central government made a major financial contribution to agricultural education. The immediate political impetus to action was the conjuncture of two social forces. The farm movement, although defeated on the issue of reciprocity, was sufficiently powerful in 1911 to extract two campaign promises from Prime Minister R.L. Borden which he subsequently fulfilled: action on grain marketing (Canada Grain Act, 1912) and assistance to the provinces for agricultural education. More importantly, though, business's increasing demand for state intervention in technical education, coupled with demands from various social groups for rural improvement through education had, in 1910, resulted in the appointment of the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education. As a result of its recommendations, Borden's government introduced the Agricultural Aid Act (1912) and the Agricultural Instruction Act (1913). The former act provided $500,000 and the latter one $10 million over ten years for the provinces to use in the improvement of rural economic, social and educational conditions. These funds, of which Manitoba received approximately $850,000, formed the financial basis for the rapid expansion of rural education between 1913 and 1923.[3]

Prior to Manitoba's entry into Confederation in 1870 there were scattered attempts to promote agricultural knowledge at Red River. Hay Field Farm was established near Fort Douglas in 1817 as a site for agricultural experiments, while the Hudson's Bay Company initiated experimental farms at the settlement in 1830 and again in 1838. Agricultural fairs were held in the settlement as early as 1832. It was not until Manitoba was granted provincial status within Canada, however, that a more systematic promotion of agricultural improvement and knowledge was undertaken. Following the example of Ontario, the government passed legislation in 1872 establishing a provincial Agricultural and Industrial Society and enabling the formation of local agricultural societies. Societies were charged with the responsibilty of encouraging agriculture through the importation of improved seed and

livestock, awarding prizes for crop and livestock improvement, and generally pursuing excellence in agricultural work. The structure of agricultural societies remained essentially unchanged between 1872 and 1900, while their practical function during the period was almost exclusively the sponsorship of agricultural fairs.[4]

Farmers' institutes, which proved to be more important than agricultural societies in the development of agricultural education, were introduced to Manitoba in 1890. Under the terms of the Farmers' Institute Act of that year, twenty-five persons could petition the Minister of Agriculture requesting the formation of a farmers' institute, which entitled the institute to a provincial grant of fifty cents per member, access to municipal grants and the use of provincially funded speakers. Local institutes undertook to hold meetings and hear and discuss lectures on agricultural topics. Farmers' institutes existed as separate entities until 1900 when they were integrated with agricultural societies. After 1900 institutes operated solely under the auspices of local agricultural societies, although provision was made for the formation of institutes in areas where agricultural societies were not organized.[5]

In the early years of the new century the domain of agricultural knowledge in Manitoba was transformed by the establishment of Manitoba Agricultural College. In 1904 the Manitoba Agricultural College Act was passed creating the college and allocating $100,000 for construction. From 1904 until 1924 the agricultural college functioned essentially as an institution separate from the university. Between 1905 and 1912 MAC was affiliated with the university to the extent that degrees were granted by the university and the University Council appointed members to the MAC Board of Directors. In 1912, however, MAC completely severed its ties with the university. The college operated as a separate degree-granting institution until 1916 when it reaffiliated with the university under essentially the same terms as the pre-1912 arrangement. From 1916 to 1924 MAC continued what was basically a nominal connection with the university: it was a creature of the Department of Agriculture rather than the Department of Education, with its own president and its own advisory board. In 1924, however, as a result of economic conditions and the recommendations of the Murray Commission, MAC ceased to exist as a separate entity. It was incorporated into the University of Manitoba in that year as the Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics, although it did retain its own advisory council.[6]

Building upon the agricultural societies and farmers' institutes, MAC and the Agricultural Instruction Act became the institutional and financial infrastructure for the construction of a rural extension service in the second decade of the century. Between 1910 and 1913 the MAC administration and staff established the parameters of future work by initiating activities for women, men and youth. In 1910 the organization of Home Economics societies was begun under the authority of the Home Economics Societies Act. A year later the college and the railways instituted Better Farming Trains to take scientific agriculture to the countryside. And, in 1913, the college and the Department of Education introduced Boys' and Girls' Clubs to Manitoba and to Canada. In the decade after 1913, as a direct result of the Dominion grants, the extension service grew from a part-time activity of the MAC faculty to a branch of the Department of Agriculture with a director, assistant director and staff.[7]

Manitoba Agricultural College: Administration and Staffing

MAC was the central educational institution in Manitoba agriculture. The main constituent disciplines of theoretical ideology were situated there, with agricultural economics, home economics and rural sociology all emerging as distinct areas of enquiry and study in the college's first decade. The components of practical ideology were organized at MAC as well, and the extension service was either managed through the college or was closely connected with it. Finally, it was the professional school in which not only agricultural and home economics intellectuals were trained, but also the farm women and men who would serve as role models and social leaders in individual rural communities.

Throughout the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Ontario settlers in Manitoba who sought agricultural guidance and advice had been content to rely upon the Ontario Agricultural College in Guelph. Increasingly in the 1890s, however, as it became apparent that Ontario agriculture was not the same as Manitoba agriculture, local agitation developed for a similar institution there. Hence, in 1901 the Roblin government appointed a commission to enquire into the question of agricultural education in the province. The seven-man commission was empowered to investigate the advisability of forming an agricultural college, its probable cost and the best methods of operating such an institution. The commissioners studied agricultural education in Britain, Europe and other parts of North America, with excursions to Guelph, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin and Michigan. This process yielded a series of recommendations affecting every level of the educational system. With respect to postsecondary education, the commission recommended that an agricultural college be established to offer instruction in agriculture and domestic science. Indeed, the commissioners felt that it was important that domestic science and agricultural instruction be linked. Men would be trained in the practical subjects of agriculture, including the production and distribution of wealth, while women would receive training in the various aspects of domestic science, enabling them to take their rightful place as helpmates for farm men.[8]

Upon submission of the report the Roblin government passed legislation and voted funds for the construction of MAC. On 28 May 1904 the Board of Directors met for the first time. That meeting and the five others held that year were largely concerned with problems of construction. It was not until the following year that the board turned its attention to questions of staffing and curriculum. In the spring of 1905 the first appointments were made, with W.J. Black as principal and professor of animal husbandry and W.J. Carson as professor of dairying. During 1906 five more appointments were made.[9] Although a couple of short courses in dairying were held during 1905-06, MAC formally opened on 6 November 1906 with an enrolment of eighty-two in the two-year diploma course. By the following academic year, 1907-08, MAC was firmly established as a teaching institution with a total attendance of 220 and a teaching staff consisting of the principal, six professors, four lecturers, demonstrators in cheese and butter making, an instructor in mechanics, a matron, a farm foreman, a stenographer, a bursar, an assistant engineer, a carpenter, a gardener and a number of labourers.[10]

Throughout MAC's life the Board of Directors operated as an advisory body to the Minister of Agriculture. Although no independent authority was vested in the board, it did have a significant role to play in college governance. Following the

initial activity of construction and establishing a faculty, the board settled into the regular matters of maintaining the physical plant, maintaining and policing the staff, adopting and approving programs and courses, and conducting relations with other agricultural and educational organizations in the province. In the mundane matters of routine college administration, which accounted for the bulk of their work, the board's advice was accepted and they effectively ran the college. On other issues, however, such as staffing and the site change from Tuxedo to Fort Garry, the board felt ignored from time to time. In 1910, for example, the board requested a meeting with the minister in order to clarify its duties, passing a motion expressing "disappointment and regret that they were in no way consulted by the government as to the change of site of the agricultural college and that no intimation even of the purchase of a new site had been made to them."[11] Similarly, a lengthy discussion took place in a 1919 board meeting regarding the powers of the board to make appointments and fix salaries. According to the minutes of the meeting, "much dissatisfaction was expressed by individual members of the board with the action of the Department of Agriculture in repeatedly vetoing the board's appointments and ignoring its recommendations."[12] Boards under various governments, then, felt a certain amount of frustration in dealing with the Minister of Agriculture.

The board was constituted as a mixture of government appointees and representatives from other bodies. The first board contained four government appointees (including Premier Roblin as an *ex-officio* member), two representatives from the university Board of Governors, and four "practical farmers" elected by the agricultural societies.[13] In 1912, when the college gained its autonomy, the MAC board suggested that the two representatives previously appointed by the university now be appointed by the agricultural societies. The government rejected this advice, however, and the 1913-14 board contained six government appointees (including J.A.M. Aikins who had previously been appointed by the university board) and four agricultural society representatives.[14] With the election of the reformist Liberal government in 1915 the board went through another change. The 1915 board retained its six government appointees (although the faces were different), but the farmer members were changed from representatives of the agricultural societies to representatives of the grain growers and livestock associations. Moreover, for the first time the board of ten people contained two female members.[15] This structure remained virtually intact until 1924 when the Board of Directors was transformed into a Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics Advisory Council. By this time the board-*cum*-council included five government members (of whom one was the only woman member) and one representative each from the livestock association, the agricultural societies, the MAC alumni association and the United Farmers. In the transition from board to council, however, the body's power was seriously curtailed, although its mere existence in the university was something of a concession. The council's advice was given to the university's Board of Governors rather than the Minister of Agriculture (who ceased to have responsibility for agricultural education in any event), and it appears its effective authority was limited to the field of rural extension.[16]

The daily administration of the college was conducted by the president, and the informal line of authority and communication was between the president and the Minister of Agriculture. MAC had five presidents during its existence: W.J. Black, 1905-15; J.B. Reynolds, 1915-20; John Bracken, 1920-22; C.H. Lee (acting president), 1922-24; and W.H. McKillican who, in 1924, was the last president of MAC and the first Dean of Agriculture and Home Economics.

W.J. Black was a graduate of OAC who came to the presidency from *The Farmers' Advocate*. An ambitious man, he was no doubt responsible for MAC's transformation into an independent institution in 1913. His initial appointment was due to his Conservative party connections, and this inevitably led to his dismissal by the Liberals in 1915.[17] J.B. Reynolds's appointment as Black's replacement represented something of a transition in the way the MAC presidency was perceived and the way MAC presidents were appointed. Reynolds and his three successors were all career agricultural scientists or agricultural academics. Reynolds was on the faculty of OAC prior to coming to MAC, and returned to the presidency there in 1920; Bracken was employed as a Dominion government crop scientist and the Saskatchewan government director of Farmers' Institutes before his MAC appointment; C.H. Lee had been on the MAC faculty as professor of botany and bacteriology since 1909; and W.C. McKillican came from the superintendency of the Brandon Experimental Farm. Although Black employed the language of scientific agriculture, and was connected with the American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Farmers' Institutes, he represented an older voluntarist approach to agricultural knowledge: not only was he politically partisan, but he was formed as an educator more by practical farming and agricultural journalism than by academic training. Reynolds and his successors, meanwhile, were committed agricultural scientists who trained, worked and made their careers in the new educational institutions.[18]

The various boards and presidents were faced with the recurring problem of MAC's relationship with the University of Manitoba. In the history of North American agricultural colleges there was a strong tradition of independence from other postsecondary institutions. Colleges such as OAC, Iowa Agricultural College and North Dakota Agricultural College had become strong schools without affiliating with a university. Interested commentators and people associated with MAC looked to these examples when arguing for an independent agricultural college. Two interrelated arguments were proffered. First, it was felt that the university represented an urban influence that would be unhealthy for young farm women and men. Second, there was a desire to establish a specialized and technical curriculum, and it was felt this would be jeopardized by association with the university's more classical curriculum.[19] MAC, of course, achieved complete autonomy in 1912 and maintained that status for four years. Reaffiliation in 1916, however, marked the beginning of MAC's journey to faculty status in the University of Manitoba. As noted above, independence in 1912-16 had as much to do with Black's careerism and his politics as it had to do with the ideology of autonomy. Hence, with a new government and a new college president, the question of affiliation was raised again. Reynolds made the case for affiliation in his first report, arguing that MAC graduates wanted the increased prestige of a university degree and that affiliation would assist the university by bringing it into association with technical instruction in agriculture. He had one reservation however. It was important to him that the Board of Directors not lose any control over the course of studies or the conditions of admission to the college. The final arrangement allowed the board to retain its control, while giving MAC representation on the University Council.[20] Economic imperatives caused the eventual amalgamation in 1924. In these new circumstances the advisory council was indeed purely advisory, with the university's Board of Governors being the final authority. The council's function was essentially one of keeping the urban-based university board sensitive to the needs of farm people.[21]

Between 1905 and 1924 the MAC teaching staff grew from three men (including the principal) to about forty women and men. During that twenty-year period approximately 138 people taught in the college for various lengths of time. Although there was something of an expansion in hiring in the middle years, with as many as fourteen being hired in 1915, the annual rate of hiring was fairly constant throughout the period, averaging about seven. To the extent that the period from, say, 1913 to 1918 or 1919 represented something of a buoyant labour market for agricultural and home economic academics, there are three probable causes for the phenomenon. First, the impact of the war on MAC was such that positions (often temporary ones) became vacant as male faculty joined the military. Second, monies available through the federal Agricultural Instruction Act allowed the college to hire additional faculty to serve as extension lecturers. Third, the sustained growth of the home economics division really dates from 1913, although the program commenced in 1910 when three academic staff were hired. Of the 138 faculty who were employed at the college, something is known about the background of eighty-five of them. Using information culled from new staff announcements published in *Managra* (the MAC student publication), the geographic origin, educational background, previous employment and initial academic rank at MAC of these people can be determined in varying degrees.[22]

The information on geographic origin suggests that, especially in the early years (1905-10), MAC relied heavily on Ontario and the United States for its academic staff and, after 1910, Manitoba supplied a surprisingly high proportion of the male teaching staff.[23] The home economics division (all female) relied most heavily on Ontario and the United States, with two-thirds of the faculty coming from those areas (five of fourteen from the former and four of fourteen from the latter). Only two (of fourteen) Manitoba women were hired in the whole period. The remaining three women came from Ireland, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan. In the case of the agriculture division, nearly 40 percent of the forty-five men came from Ontario, while 16 percent were from the United States. What is more remarkable about agriculture, though, is that one-third of the total staff were Manitobans or, to put it in more dramatic terms, 50 percent of the thirty men hired between 1911 (when the first two Manitobans were hired) and 1923 were either born or raised in Manitoba. The remaining faculty came from Scotland (three), England (two), and Quebec (one).[24]

The educational background of the MAC faculty is significant for three reasons: it confirms the pattern suggested by geographic origin, it shows that the majority of those hired were themselves agricultural college graduates, and it reveals that only a small percentage of the staff had graduate training.[25] On the first point, 27 percent of those hired were MAC graduates, 22 percent were trained in American institutions, and 46 percent were graduates of Ontario colleges and universities. Of the Ontario graduates, almost two-thirds had been students at Guelph (OAC and Macdonald Institute), one-third of the American graduates (one-half of the male American graduates) were from the Iowa State College of Agriculture at Ames, and all but one of the Manitoba graduates were MAC alumni. On the second point, three-quarters of the faculty were themselves graduates of home economics or agricultural colleges. This is hardly surprising since, especially in the case of agriculture, the required training was almost solely available in the specialist, technical colleges. As well, MAC faculty and administration tended to idealize OAC and Iowa State, attempting to model their college

on these older institutions. What is perhaps more revealing on this point is the glaring imbalance in Manitoba itself. Twenty MAC graduates were hired as compared to only one Manitoba College graduate, who happened to have a first degree from the University of Edinburgh (R.W. Murchie). A graduate of Brandon College who went on to Macdonald Institute, and a Wesley College alumnus who did graduate work at Harvard, also managed to find employment at MAC. Something of the rural antipathy towards the University of Manitoba is no doubt reflected in these data. On the final point, more than 80 percent of MAC faculty had only one degree when they were first hired or (in the case of some of the engineering faculty) no degree at all. Those who did second degrees or certificates tended to be from a teaching background, while those who did graduate work were mostly in veterinary science or more purely academic subjects such as chemistry and English. Those teaching the new agricultural and home economics subjects (including rural sociology and agricultural economics) began their careers having only received the general degree.

The information on previous work experience indicates that a large proportion of the MAC faculty had previous teaching experience, while very few of the men had actually operated a farm.[26] Forty percent of the faculty had taught at some level of the educational system, with the largest number of these having previous university or college experience. The next largest group consisted of recent graduates (20 percent) whose first employment was at MAC: half of these were MAC graduates, a number appear to have been sessional appointments, and most, but not all, were appointed as lecturers or instructors. Women and men with experience in government departments (district representatives, experimental farms, etc.) were next, accounting for 18 percent. The men who taught agricultural engineering and farm mechanics, meanwhile, were hired more on the basis of practical experience than academic merit. Hence, five of the eight engineering faculty hired between 1905 and 1913 had experience in factory production. Of the remaining faculty, one had solely farming experience, while two others had farming experience as well as some other previous employment, two had backgrounds in agricultural journalism, two had served in the armed services during the war, and two had experience in farm management or agro-industry. Most of the people who found themselves teaching at MAC, then, were either career educators or career agriculturalists. A surprisingly small number had farm-operation experience, experience in agro-industry, or a background in agricultural journalism.

The collective experience of MAC faculty indicates an increasing consciousness of their own identity and a growing sense that they possessed certain rights within the institution. Especially in the 1920s, an era of postwar inflation and fiscal conservatism, issues of salary and college governance became important points of contention with the administration.

In 1909, the earliest year for which a complete salary scale exists, the salary range was as follows: principal, $2,500; professors, $2,000-$2,250; lecturers, $1,000-$1,500; and support staff salaries ranging from $840 for the farm foreman and the gardener to $300 for the librarian.[27] This structure remained more or less intact for a number of years. The Board of Directors announced in 1912 that the salaries for department heads had been raised to $2,400 per year and that it was their wish to have professors' salaries "raised to $3000 per annum in the very near future."[28] As it turned out, the "very near future" was 1916 for, in that year,

a permanent salary structure was put in place for male and female staff. The schedule for men was $2,600-$3,000 for professors, $2,100-$2,500 for associate professors, $1,600-$2,000 for lecturers, and $1,000-$1,500 for assistants, with annual increases after one year of service. The women's schedule was $1,700-$2,400 for department heads, and $900-$1,600 for assistants, with annual increases of $100 from the minimum to the maximum.[29]

By 1919, however, the president was reporting to the government that, in the face of a drop in enrolment from 360 to 200 over four years, the college was having difficulty maintaining its staff and justifying its existence. Notwithstanding the fact that labour costs had increased in all departments from 30 to 50 percent of the total budget, and the staff were receiving their annual increases according to the 1916 schedule, staff salaries were not keeping pace with the cost of living. Hence it was necessary to offer salaries above the schedule to new faculty.[30] It was in this context that the faculty made their first organized representation to the Board of Directors in the form of a petition presented in October 1919. They presented their case as follows:

> There is at present a great deal of unrest and dissatisfaction among the members of the Agricultural College staff which is detrimental to the best interests of the College. We feel that this is largely due to the unsatisfactory salary schedules which have not been revised since 1916, although the cost of living has gone up approximately 100%. It is conceded that the salaries of those engaged in the teaching profession in general are inadequate having regard to years of training required, the value of the service rendered and particularly having regard to the present high cost of living. In addition we find that the salaries paid at the Agricultural College are low in comparison with the salaries in the teaching profession in general, and in particular when compared with other institutions in the West doing similar work. Members of our staff have left the institution for the above reason and others are contemplating doing so. We have felt, however, that it is our duty to endeavour to remedy the situation rather than either abandon the teaching profession or take positions in other institutions.[31]

This was not the broader trade union rhetoric of 1919, of course. Within the deferential contours of educational discourse, however, it must be seen as a language of rights, identity and challenge. For the faculty to suggest, for example, that the situation must either be remedied or they would be forced to leave the college, and perhaps the profession, was to challenge the administration with the only legitimate sense of collective identity available to them. The resolution was accompanied by a proposed new schedule, including comparative data from other institutions. The faculty requested the following salary range: instructors (male), $1,800-$2,400; instructors (female), $1,500-$1,800; lecturers (male), $2,000-$2,600; lecturers (female), $1,800-$2,100; associate professors (male), $2,700-$3,000; associate professors (female), $2,100-$2,600; professors (male), $3,000-$3,600; and directors (female), $2,600-$3,000.

The board was actually quite forthcoming in its response to the faculty. Although a motion was passed at the October 1919 meeting affirming that the faculty request had to be considered in the context of the financial conditions of the college, a new schedule was adopted early in 1920 which, while not meeting the faculty requests, did include substantial increases under the circumstances. Under the new schedule the ranges were instructor (male), $1,500-$2,000; instructor/librarian (female), $1,200-$1,500; lecturer (male), $2,000-$2,400; lecturer (female),

$1,500-$,1800; associate professor (male), $2,400-$2,800; associate professor (female), $1,800-$2,400; professor (male), $2,800-$3,500; and director (female), $2,200-$2,800.[32]

The MAC faculty's first, and only, attempt at collective bargaining was a relative success in that they were able to initiate a general pay increase in the college. By 1922, however, the board instituted a pay freeze, allowing only a limited number of salary increases. When MAC became the Faculty of Agriculture and Home Economics in 1925, college salaries were generally lower than those in the rest of the university. A report from President Maclean and Dean McKillican recommended an equalization of salaries, but Premier Bracken was not prepared to increase the budget.[33]

Manitoba Agricultural College: Disciplinary Structures of Rural Social Science

It was within this general structure that ideologies were constituted within the college, but the specific structures that developed in the relevant disciplines should be understood in the context of the broader North American pattern. Home economics, agricultural economics and rural sociology emerged in the late nineteenth century and were maturing as areas of specialization in North American scholarship during the second decade of the new century. At about the same time, in the years following 1910, they were also becoming established at MAC, with distinctive disciplines, boundaries, courses and programs of research.

Mount Holyoke Seminary instituted a form of domestic education in 1837, but it was really the land grant colleges that established American home economics instruction after the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. Indeed the subject flourished in these agricultural and mechanical colleges rather than the Ivy League women's colleges where it was viewed as being too narrowly focussed for the education of cultured women. By the 1890s, and concurrent with professionalizing initiatives in other areas of knowledge, home economics was becoming organized as a discipline. The most significant aspect of this endeavour was the series of Lake Placid conferences which began in 1899 and culminated in 1908 with the formation of the American Home Economics Association (AHEA). During this decade home economists established their claim to have their domain considered a legitimate area of expertise. The first conference abandoned the name "household arts" in favour of home economics, hoping that a linguistic identification with economics might be a first step in easing the way into college and university curricula. A conference committee later recommended a number of strategies for entering various curricular areas: household management in economics, family studies in sociology, nutrition and the chemistry of foods in natural science, and family history and the history of the home in history. At the tenth conference, besides formally establishing the AHEA, resolutions were adopted to broaden the organization and establish the paraphernalia of professionalism. Delegates decided to publish a journal, form state organizations, establish a dues structure, and encourage secondary and primary teachers to join the association.[34]

Home economics instruction commenced at MAC shortly after the organization of the AHEA. In the summer of 1910 twenty-one women took the first course offered by the newly formed Department of Household Science. It was the fall of 1911, however, before a regular two-year course of study was implemented for

which students received a diploma. In 1914 the diploma program was supplemented by a special course for teachers and a professional course for diploma graduates seeking employment in institutions. One year later a three-year course, for which the diploma was a prerequisite, was added to provide degree-level training which, in 1920, became a separate five-year program.[35]

Between 1911 and 1919, and chiefly as a result of the introduction of the degree program in 1915, the home economics curriculum grew from ten to approximately forty courses offering instruction in the social, medical and natural sciences. The original ten included "Nursing" and "Physiology and Hygiene" so women could properly care for family members, "Millinery" and "Sewing and Dressmaking" to provide garment-making skills, a range of courses (Home Sanitation, Laundry, Home Furnishing, Household Handicraft and Cookery) teaching the scientific basis and fundamental skills of home maintenance, "English" to add a touch of gentility to what was basically a vocational education, and "Household Management." After 1915, courses such as cookery were expanded to include "Cooking," "Foods" and "Dietetics," partially transforming a simple food preparation course into embryonic food science courses. Furthermore, "House Planning," "Bacteriology" and "Arithmetic" were added to supplement the work in other courses. Instruction in "Horticulture," "Dairy Husbandry" and "Poultry" was begun in order to train farm women for productive roles (in market terms). In the degree program, courses were organized into household science and household arts departments, and some purely scientific courses (taught by the agricultural faculty) were added. Household management, foods, the history of home life and book reviews were incorporated into household science, while household arts included dressmaking, millinery, costume design, textiles, home planning and embroidery. Degree students also took other courses ranging from chemistry to music.[36]

With the overall reorganization of the MAC curriculum in 1919-20, there was a realignment of home economics courses towards more precise disciplinary boundaries. Gone were the old categories of household arts and household science, replaced by nine course groupings having the appearance of departments without, as yet, possessing departmental apparatus. Hence, in 1919 home economics students encountered a curricular structure that included cookery, foods and nutrition, clothing, housing, textiles, physiology and hygiene, household management, pedagogy and institutional management. In the 1920s the curriculum became more streamlined as the number of regular courses dropped from forty-two to forty, and the number of general areas shrank from nine to seven.[37]

Unlike the MAC presidency, which underwent a transition to professionalism in the teens, the home economics division had a professional orientation from its inception in 1910. A.B. Juniper, the first director, was attracted to MAC from the deanship of household science at Macdonald College (McGill), and later went on to the principalship of a domestic science college in England. Her successor was E. Charlton-Salisbury, trained at Rochester Polytechnic and formerly employed at Women's Union Domestic Science College in Buffalo, New York. From 1915 to 1925, there were three more directors, all with good academic backgrounds — E.M. Eadie (from Mount Allison and University of Toronto), Mary Kelso (trained at OAC), and Mary Hiltz (a Columbia University graduate). More significantly, though, MAC faculty (especially Juniper) were instrumental in the formation of

the Manitoba Home Economics Association in 1911. All three MAC home economists were present, along with four other women, at the inaugural meeting in January of that year. The aims of the association included contact with the AHEA (members regularly attended AHEA conventions, although formal affiliation did not take place until 1915), provincial agitation for a home economics experimental station, and general liaison between the women of Manitoba and the manufacturers of household products. Membership was limited to women actually employed in the profession, although associate memberships were available and the formation of a "Housewives League" was discussed in 1912 as a kind of housekeepers' auxiliary. Association activities, beyond regular meetings, consisted mainly of trips to commercial establishments in the food sector. During 1911 and 1912 members visited Milton Bakery, Crescent Creamery, Paulin Chambers and the restaurant at Eaton's.[38]

The discipline of agricultural economics took form in North America between the 1890s and the 1920s. Two distinct groups — agronomists studying farm management in agricultural colleges and economists analyzing the broader agricultural economy in universities — were involved in its creation. Farm management emerged out of the general agricultural courses, taught in nineteenth-century agricultural colleges, that treated the whole range of agricultural practice as a single area of study. As other specializations such as field husbandry and animal husbandry developed, courses in "agriculture" and "agronomy" were narrowed to topics of farm organization and the business of farming. By the turn of the century agronomists were borrowing economists' techniques in order to study management practices on individual farms. In 1902, for example, the Minnesota Agricultural Experimental Station, under the direction of Andrew Boss, began a series of cost of production studies whereby farmers, working with specialists, kept detailed records of actual farm costs. At about the same time, George Warren of Cornell initiated survey methods, involving personal interviews with farmers to ascertain their incomes and expenses. In 1913 Warren published *Farm Management* as a college text which systematized the work that he, Boss and others had been doing over the previous ten to fifteen years.[39] Moreover, in 1910 these and other agronomists, who were all concentrating on farm management, formed the American Farm Management Association as an expression of their disciplinary and professional aspirations. During the same period academic economists such as Henry Taylor and Thomas Nixon Carver were focussing on what they called "rural economics" or "farm economics," attempting to establish a space for agriculture within economic discourse.[40] They tried to form a Farm Economics section in the American Economics Association (AEA), but when this proposal was rejected by the AEA they established the National Association of Farm Economists in 1910. Through joint research projects and friendly overtures over the following decade a common space was created between the two groups and, in 1919, the American Farm Management Association and the National Association of Farm Economists merged to form the American Farm Economics Association. Agricultural economics, as a unified discipline, may be dated from this merger.[41]

Agricultural economics was taught in various forms at MAC between 1907 and 1919. In 1919, however, the courses were brought together in a rural economics department which, in 1926, merged with rural sociology. Prior to 1916 there was no distinct farm management course. Rather, farm management was covered in agronomy or, more often, as part of field husbandry. Rural economics was first

38

taught in 1910-11, and continued until 1916 when it was incorporated with farm management for most levels of instruction. Between 1916 and 1919, courses varied among farm management, agricultural economics and rural economics. Then, in 1919, the general curricular reorganization produced a distinct department containing courses in farm business and accounting, farm management, economics, agricultural economics and agricultural legislation. This structure remained relatively unchanged until 1925 when two marketing courses, two courses on farm movements and cooperation, and a course each on the economic geography of agriculture, finance and statistics were added. Then, the following year, the Department of Economics and Sociology was born.[42]

The emergence of agricultural economics as a discipline at MAC was reflected in the increasing specialization of the faculty who taught the subject between 1907 and 1926. Agronomy in 1907-08, and rural economics between 1908 and 1910, were taught by Principal W.J. Black. Black, although trained at OAC, was a former agricultural journalist with no specialist training in agricultural economics. Similarly, the field husbandry instructors who taught farm management in the early years were natural scientists rather than economists. The 1914 appointment of George White as MAC's first professor of farm management reflected both a move towards specialization and the retention of older attitudes to farm management instruction. White spent six months of the year at MAC and the other six months on his 1,000-acre farm near LaSalle where, according to President Reynolds, he acquired "the practical experience and the scientific data specially necessary in farm management instruction." Indeed Reynolds noted three components in White's suitability for his job at MAC: his training at OAC, his business experience with the Grain Growers' Grain Company (GGGC), and his work as a practical farmer. When he died in 1916 his work was divided, not among fellow faculty members, but between C.B. Piper of the Empire Elevator Company and Thomas Crerar of the GGGC. White's eventual replacement, however, was Alva Benton, a trained agricultural economist. Benton, appointed in 1918, completed a doctorate in farm credit for the University of Wisconsin in 1921. He, in turn, was supplemented and eventually replaced by H.C. Grant, the first person to receive graduate training in agricultural economics in Manitoba.[43]

Like agricultural economics, rural sociology emerged as a disciplinary domain in the 1890s. In 1892 and 1896, amid economic depression and agrarian insurgency, the American Economics Association held sessions on "The Farmers' Movement" and "The Agricultural Question" in which social scientists such as Richard Ely, John Commons and Franklin Giddings participated. And, in 1893, Reverend Josiah Strong published a book calling attention to the exodus of people from the country to the city. It was during the following decade, however, that the notion of a "rural problem" developed to focus and define rural sociology. Kenyon Butterfield (at the University of Michigan) and John Gillette (at the University of North Dakota) began teaching "rural sociology" early in the decade, while the Protestant Interchurch World Movement conducted surveys of thousands of rural churches during those same years. Most importantly, though, significant state initiatives were undertaken around the end of the decade which contributed to the growing legitimacy of rural sociology. In the United States Roosevelt appointed the Country Life Commission to enquire into the "problem" of country life, while in Canada both the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education and the Commission of Conservation focussed attention on this newly found problem.[44]

Following closely upon the release of the Country Life Commission report, the American Sociological Association chose "Rural Life" as the theme of its 1912 convention and, during those meetings, the Rural Sociological Society was formed to provide rural sociologists with an institutional identity. By the time of the publication of John Gillette's synthetic *Constructive Rural Sociology* and John McDougall's *Rural Life in Canada: Its Trends and Tasks* in 1913, rural sociology had become firmly established as an area of research and analysis.[45] And parallelling agricultural economics, the characteristic area of study was the individual community and the characteristic methodology was the rural survey. In the most energetic research project of the 1910s, the Interchurch World Movement undertook a survey of rural life in the United States which covered 2,400 counties and involved 8,000 people working as researchers.[46]

The first MAC rural sociology courses were offered in the immediate context of the Presbyterian Church's community surveys of Turtle Mountain and Swan River in 1913. In 1914 and 1915 an extracurricular "rural problems" class met at the college on Thursday evenings, discussing such topics as the country church, the country school, and boys and girls clubs. This class entered the curriculum as "Rural Sociology" in 1916, absorbing the "General History" course which had been taught from 1913. Henceforth, rural sociology courses for both diploma and degree students, using Gillette's *Constructive Rural Sociology* and G.W. Fiske's *Challenge of the Country* as texts, became permanent fixtures in the college. In 1919 a range of history courses re-entered the curriculum, including "History of Agriculture" and "Canadian History and Civics." Then, in 1921, the history/civics and rural sociology offerings were combined to create a Department of Rural Sociology and Civics. By this time rural sociology included courses in rural leadership, sociology, rural sociology and methods of rural survey work. In 1926, when rural sociology was absorbed by agricultural economics, the department also included courses in statistics and industrial history.[47]

Sociological research and instruction at MAC was dominated by R.W. Murchie. A native of Scotland, Murchie was trained there and at Wesley College before joining the MAC faculty in 1915. Immediately prior to his appointment he worked on the Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys. Over the following fifteen years Murchie taught virtually all of the rural sociology courses, engaged in various research projects, and completed a University of Minnesota doctorate. With the assistance of the newly appointed district representatives, he surveyed rural home conditions in Killarney, Portage and "the Ruthenian districts" in 1916. He also conducted rural leadership courses during this period, especially for ministers and ministers' wives. In the 1920s Murchie was increasingly called upon to do work for the United Farmers of Manitoba government. From a study of the social and economic conditions of closed school districts for the Murray Commission in 1923, through the Unused Lands Survey of 1924 (which became his doctoral dissertation), to his 1927 chairmanship of the committee enquiring into seasonal unemployment, Murchie was the most important social scientist working for Bracken during this period. Although he left Manitoba in 1930 to succeed C.C. Zimmerman as professor of rural sociology at the University of Minnesota, Murchie's major contribution to Canadian social science was his senior authorship of *Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier* (1936) for the Canadian Frontiers of Settlement Series.[48]

Rural Adult Education

Rural adult education in Manitoba underwent an important transition in the early twentieth century. Between 1890 and 1925 the infrastructure expanded from a few semi-autonomous and local agricultural societies and farmers' institutes, catering to a male elite, to a centralized apparatus built around MAC, ostensibly serving all farm women and men. Prior to 1907 the field was defined by the agricultural societies and farmers' institutes. After that an extension service was established, becoming firmly entrenched during the decade of funding under the Agricultural Instruction Act.

Manitoba institutes were coordinated by the Manitoba Central Farmers' Institute (MCFI) until 1897 when the Department of Agriculture assumed direct control over the work. The MCFI, consisting of delegates from local institutes, met annually in convention throughout the nineties. These meetings consisted of two sorts of activities. First, papers were presented by speakers ranging from OAC people to Manitoba educators and Manitoba farmers. Second, delegates engaged in nonpartisan discussion of various public policy questions (partisan discussion was forbidden). The 1894 convention, for example, passed resolutions urging the teaching of agriculture in primary schools, the appointment of a royal commission on freight rates and tariff reform. The officers and directors of MCFI, from various parts of the province, met a number of times during the year. The president for many years was James Elder of Virden, followed by A.P. Stevenson of Morden (who was later instrumental in having the Morden experimental farm established), and the honorary president in the 1890s was S.A. Bedford of the Brandon Experimental Farm.[49]

Local institutes were held during the winter months, with two speakers normally attending each meeting. Afternoons were devoted to the presentation and discussion of papers, while evenings were reserved for socializing. In 1896 the nine institute lecturers delivered a total of ninety-six lectures to institutes throughout the province. Not all institute meetings involved a visiting lecturer, however. The ideal, in fact, was to develop local discussion and debate around questions of agricultural improvement. In 1895, for example, the Melita institute produced a paper, discussion and successful resolution characterizing agricultural societies as elitist, and proposing that society monies be diverted to the establishment of creameries and cheese factories.[50]

The institutes were only a slight improvement over the agricultural societies, however. Institute secretaries claimed that those presenting papers tended to be a small group of older farmers and that they had a difficult time attracting younger farmers to the meetings. The general pattern seemed to be that the older men attended the afternoon sessions while the younger men did chores. The young men then came out for the evening social event.[51] This male exclusiveness was a problem. A farm woman suggested in 1897 that women should attend the regular meetings as well as the social events, since they were engaged in many productive activities on the farm.[52]

As a result of criticism directed at both the institutes and the agricultural societies, the two educational methods were amalgamated in 1900. At the local level, institute work continued essentially as it had before, but under the control of agricultural society directors rather than institute secretaries. Provincially, however, the amalgamation marked the beginning of a transition from nineteenth-century

voluntarism to the state direction of the later extension service. In the early years of the decade the farm press was urging the provincial government to follow Ontario's lead and appoint a superintendent of institute work. The 1905 appointment of W.J. Black as Deputy Minister of Agriculture, with a mandate to develop agricultural education, suggests the advice was being heeded.[53]

Black immediately took responsibility for agricultural societies and farmers' institutes. After MAC opened (with Black as president), these activities became integrated into the work of the college. With faculty members to act as judges, the societies expanded their role beyond the sponsorship of fall and summer fairs. Winter seed fairs were added, as were standing grain crop and good farming competitions. Plowing matches, which had been held sporadically prior to Black's appointment, became a regular feature of many society programs. Institutes were made more systematic and regular with a pool of faculty to draw upon as speakers. Short courses were initiated both in the country and at the college campus, which eventually replaced the institute meeting and lecture as the forum for discussions of agricultural improvement.[54]

Institutes for women began in 1910 with the organization of the first home economics societies. With the beginning of household science instruction in the college, Black instructed A.B. Juniper and M. Kennedy to tour the province establishing societies. Between 15 November and 13 December 1910 these two women visited fifteen towns, holding meetings under the auspices of the local agricultural society, in which they were able to organize fourteen new groups. There were, in fact, two local women's organizations already in existence prior to this initiative. At Valley River, near Dauphin, a "Ladies Mutual Benefit Society" had been formed in 1910. This group, which met at the same time as the local (exclusively male) Grain Growers' Association, discussed the problems of homemaking (papers were presented on "Housecleaning" and "The Dish Cloth and Its Care" at the first meeting). Women in Morris, meanwhile, organized a "Women's Institute" in August of 1910, and were subsequently issued the first home economics society charter by MAC. Delegates from these two groups joined representatives from the newly formed societies at the first provincial Household Science Association convention early in the following year.[55]

Although Black was submitting a report entitled "Department of Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work" to the minister during MAC's earliest years, it was not until 1911 that an extension branch was actually formed with the appointment of E. Ward Jones as Black's assistant. Jones assumed control of extension work as of that date. One of his first responsibilities was to organize the "Better Farming Trains" that toured the province during the summers of 1911 to 1914. A special dairy train ran in June 1910, based upon a similar program in North Dakota. One year later the concept was generalized to include all aspects of college instruction. Jointly sponsored by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and MAC, these trains ran for about one month each summer, making as many stops as possible. In 1912, for example, two trains (one CN, one CP) were equipped with refrigerator, livestock, baggage, field crops, dairy, home economics, sleeping and dairy cars. They travelled the province on the respective company lines, visiting 146 stations and reaching approximately 35,000 people through lectures and demonstrations.[56]

In 1913 Jones was joined by Hattie Gowsell, appointed as a home economics

extension worker. A year later rural extension entered a new phase with the beginning of Dominion funding. S.T. Newton was appointed superintendent of extension services in 1915, continuing in that role until 1921. During his tenure the Extension Service became a separate branch of the Department of Agriculture (1917-23). By the time the Dominion grant was withdrawn in 1923 as a cost-cutting measure, the then director (N.C. MacKay) had a staff of over thirty full- and part-time lecturers and demonstrators. With no new funds forthcoming, the staff was cut to six and the office was moved back to MAC.[57] Between 1915 and 1923, however, a number of important structures and services were established.

Probably the most significant initiative undertaken in this period was the appointment of district representatives and home demonstration agents. The district representative program was begun in 1915. Seven MAC agriculture graduates, with practical farming experience, were assigned to various points in the province. As local extension workers, these men were expected to judge at fairs, conduct short courses and extension schools, organize Boys' and Girls' Clubs and generally serve as agricultural resource people. They were often instrumental in organizing farmers into local agricultural improvement associations. T.A. Johnson, district representative at Deloraine from 1919 to 1923, for example, helped organize the Southwest Manitoba Co-operative Poultry Association, the Manitoba Sweet Clover Growers' Association (thereby introducing sweet clover to southwestern Manitoba), a regional farm bureau bringing local businessmen and farmers together, and agricultural Chautauquas. He, and other district representatives, were also closely involved in the formation of rural credit societies, which the Norris government was promoting.[58]

Home demonstration agents were not introduced until some time later. Esther Thompson, a MAC student, was hired for the summer of 1917 and 1918 to work in the Whitemouth district east of Winnipeg. Under the direction of Robert Murchie, she did "community work" in the schools and homes of the district, teaching millinery, personal hygiene, cooking and manual training. This proved to be a short-term experiment for the extension branch, however. Although there were monies available, and there was a desire to establish home demonstration agents, the department found it difficult to recruit qualified personnel. S.T. Newton wrote in his 1921 report that "there is a great scarcity of young women having the required training [for home demonstration agents], which is five years in the home economics department at an agricultural college, as well as three or four years of acceptable prior experience." Consequently agents were just becoming established when funding was curtailed. The first permanent appointment, in fact, was not made until March 1923 when T. Thordason, a MAC graduate, was assigned to the Roland/Miami area. Both the home demonstration agent and district representative programs were abandoned in 1924 when Dominion funds were no longer forthcoming.[59]

An extensive media program was established through the Extension Service and the Publications Branch of the department. The Publications Branch was formed in 1913, primarily to coordinate the printing and publishing of immigration material, crop bulletins and the proceedings of provincially chartered agricultural associations. After 1913 this work was extended to the production and distribution of bulletins and circulars, written by MAC faculty, on a range of agricultural problems. Within the Extension Service a number of media initiatives

were undertaken between 1915 and 1923. A library service allowed organizations either to participate in a circulating library system or establish their own library with financial and technical assistance from the department. Individuals could also borrow books and other material through this system. Between 1921 and 1924 an extension newsletter was published containing information from the various branches of the Department of Agriculture. Beginning about 1919 or 1920, lantern slides, and then motion pictures, were produced on various topics and particular aspects of the department's activities. These films and slides, with titles ranging from "Dairy Cattle" to "Our Ruthenian Citizens," were available for viewing by rural and agricultural groups.[60]

Agriculture in the Schools

Educational institutions for rural Manitoba children and youth were also transformed in the early twentieth century. Throughout North America nature study, school gardening, school district consolidation and vocational courses in agriculture and home economics were changing rural schooling. With publications such as *The Nature Study Idea* (1903) and *The Outlook of Nature* (1905), for example, L.H. Bailey of Cornell University included schools in the American country life movement's analysis of rural society. In the Commission on Country Life, which Bailey chaired, the rural school was identified as an institution both in need of reform and crucial to the revitalization of rural life. Similar Canadian anxieties about rural education were best typified by the activities of James Robertson and William Macdonald. Robertson, a Dominion Department of Agriculture bureaucrat, and Macdonald, a bourgeois Montreal philanthropist, joined forces in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to promote educational reform. Between 1890 and 1905 Macdonald contributed $14 million to educational projects in Canada. Most of this went to McGill University (and Macdonald College was born), but $1 million of it was used in the public schools of Canada. The most important project of Macdonald and Robertson in the area of public schooling was the establishment of four "object lesson" consolidated schools (in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Ontario) for the practical application of reform programs. Robertson subsequently chaired the Royal Commission on Technical Education and Industrial Training which, in the area of elementary and secondary rural schooling, recommended consolidation, more school gardening, and more agricultural and home economics training. This activity was accompanied by an outpouring of literature on rural education. Albert H. Leake's *The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education* (1915), for example, was a synthetic assessment of the topic in Canada and the United States, and was published in the same series as Gillette's *Constructive Rural Sociology*.[61]

Rural education for Manitoba children and youth can really be dated from the introduction of nature study to the province's schools in the mid-1890s. At a meeting of the Advisory Board of Education on 30 May 1894 a report on the teaching of agriculture in schools was presented. It recommended that nature study be taught in the middle and upper levels of instruction, accompanied by comparable training in the province's Normal Schools. The recommendations were adopted, and put into practice the following year. Ideally, nature study was to entail the observation of common plants and flowers and, in the upper grades, systematic training in plant structure. According to rural school inspectors, however, the subject was often neglected or, if covered, was limited to stories

about animals or flowers rather than actual observation. A. McIntyre reported in 1899, for example, that many teachers in his inspectoral division viewed nature study as a pleasant pastime for children rather than an integral component of a new approach to pedagogy. They had failed, he concluded, to grasp the serious nature of the work. Although inspectors lamented the failure of teachers to integrate nature study into the curriculum, for years it remained a peripheral subject with little meaning for students.[62]

By the middle of the following decade school gardening and consolidation were displacing nature study as the central media for rural education. As early as 1904 at least one rural teacher was practicing school gardening at his school by cultivating the school firebreak. Over the next half dozen years or so school gardening, because of its practical orientation, supplanted nature study in the school curriculum. At about the time that school gardening was being introduced, Manitoba's first school consolidation took place at Virden, in 1905. Although there were no Macdonald-Robertson "object lesson" schools in any of the western provinces, consolidation proved to be quite successful in Manitoba. Indeed, Manitoba educators were inspired as much by consolidation experiments in North Dakota, where similar conditions existed, as they were by Macdonald and Robertson. Prompted by concerns about conditions in the hundreds of one-room country schools in the province, the movement gained momentum after 1905, and especially after 1909 when Charles Newcombe was appointed the special inspector in charge of consolidation. By 1921, 110 consolidated school districts had been formed in Manitoba.[63]

With school gardening well established in elementary education by 1910, attention shifted to the secondary level. A Department of Education study in 1907, the royal commission report on the university in 1909, and an internal MAC committee study in 1911 all recommended some form of secondary agricultural instruction. While the Department of Education suggested that agriculture courses become part of the regular high school curriculum, the commission and the MAC committee preferred the concept of a separate agricultural high school, equivalent to an urban vocational or technical high school. The latter approach was favoured, at least initially. By the end of the 1912-13 school year five secondary schools of agriculture had been established, running from November to May and catering mainly to young men aged 14 to 22 who had not been in school for a number of years. In 1915, however, some secondary schools did offer agriculture as part of the regular curriculum, and the Department of Education bureaucrats were urging others to follow their example. There was some expansion over the next decade but, by 1924-25, most agricultural training for youth had been transferred to the Boys' and Girls' Clubs.[64]

Home economics instruction had a limited place in Manitoba's rural schools. It is true that, within the new education movement, home economics was viewed as the female component of vocational training, but in Manitoba its influence was only felt in city and town schools. There was no domestic equivalent of nature study or school gardening; indeed, these activities were designed as much for rural girls as for rural boys. Home economics was taught at the secondary level in towns such as Selkirk, Virden and Dauphin after about 1915 and this, no doubt, affected some young farm women. For the most part however, Boys' and Girls' Clubs were the most important media for training rural young people in domestic science.[65]

Although nature study was made a component of Normal School instruction in 1895, systematic teacher training in agriculture was not undertaken until after the formation of MAC. Beginning in 1909-10, and continuing in subsequent academic years, Normal School students took a one month course at the agricultural college as part of their training. In 1913 the agricultural component was supplemented by instruction in home economics. Furthermore, after the introduction of agricultural high schools in 1915, MAC agriculture graduates were in demand to staff them. MAC did not control the whole terrain of rural teacher training, however. Robert Fletcher, Deputy Minister of Education, reported in 1913 that a new Normal School had been opened in Brandon, designed to give special attention to the "rural school problem." "Its geographical location, its ample grounds, and the equipment generally," Fletcher wrote, "will aid greatly in dealing with that problem."[66]

As significant as these interventions in the public school system were, by the 1920s Boys' and Girls' Clubs had become the most important agricultural and home economics programs for young people. Boys' and Girls' Clubs originated at various points in the United States in the opening years of the century. Two rural school superintendents, Albert Graham in Ohio and O.J. Kerr in Illinois, are credited with forming the first two clubs in 1902, quite independently of each other. Over the next few years state extension services incorporated club work into their programs. By 1906, thousands of American boys and girls were engaged in agricultural and domestic competitions.[67]

The first Manitoba (and Canadian) Boys' and Girls' Clubs were formed in 1913. Two events marked the launching of the club movement in the province. First, the Winnipeg Exhibition Association organized a Farm Boys' Club for the 1913 Canadian Industrial Exhibition. One hundred farm boys were guests of the association during the exhibition. The purpose of their visit to Winnipeg, which was supervised by MAC faculty, was "to receive a practical demonstration of the benefits derived by the use of modern farm equipment."[68] Second, the Extension Service initiated a potato and fodder corn growing contest and a poultry raising contest in the spring of 1913, making grants available to individuals and groups to organize the contests in their communities. Eight local clubs (with a total membership of 460) were formed that year, and they each held a fall fair for the exhibition and judging of the produce. More clubs were formed the following year; 30,000 boys and girls were involved in the movement in Manitoba by 1919.[69]

Although organized through the Department of Agriculture, Boys' and Girls' Clubs were closely connected with the Department of Education. The typical club was organized by a local businessman (quite often a banker) at the instigation of a school inspector or a district representative. Other business people, teachers and farmers were then recruited as sponsors and leaders. The local organization was expected to provide half the funds for organizational costs and prizes, with the Extension Service supplying the rest. Both MAC faculty and the extension staff were available as judges for the club fairs, which were organized on the basis of Department of Education inspectoral divisions. With the expansion of the Extension Service after 1917, staff were hired to specialize in the direction of club work. Three MAC graduates were appointed in 1919. H.E. Wood became coordinator of Boys' and Girls' Club work, while Elizabeth Whitwell and Margaret Speechly took responsibility for team demonstration work and junior home economics. Although

the cessation of funding under the Agricultural Instruction Act had a certain detrimental effect on club work, the connection with the Department of Education did allow it to survive. Cash grants to clubs were discontinued, Whitwell and Speechly were laid off, and responsibility for club direction passed to the Department of Education's recently formed Technical Education Branch (a creature of the Dominion government's Technical Education Act of 1919).[70]

In the early years club programs consisted simply of the competitive display of produce at club fairs, with cash prizes allotted to the winners. Over the years, the contests grew from the corn, potatoes and chickens of 1913 to include, by 1917, twelve categories ranging from "Noxious Weeds" and "Essay Writing" to "Cookery" and "Garment Making." By the later teens, however, the concept of team demonstration competitions was expanding and changing the focus of club activity. In 1917 two Winnipeg milling companies offered special prizes in breadmaking competitions. This prompted the formation of teams at the local club level demonstrating a variety of domestic and agricultural techniques. Then, in 1920, Eaton's, Lake of the Woods Milling Company and Western Canada Milling Company began sponsoring provincial team demonstration competitions. Local teams were chosen to compete in Winnipeg against other teams. The local production competitions continued during this period, although they too were undergoing a transition. As a result of both the emergence of team demonstrations and the withdrawal of staff support by the Extension Service, specialized clubs led by local volunteers were organized at the local level. In an ironic departure from the growth of professionalism, local people with a specific expertise (in farm mechanics, sewing or gardening, for example) became leaders of these specialized clubs.[71]

During the years after 1890, but especially in the decade from 1913 to 1923, public educational institutions were established in Manitoba agriculture. The agricultural societies and farmers' institutes of the nineteenth century were supplemented and systematized with the organization of the government extension service in the first decade of the twentieth century. The Manitoba Agricultural College became the central institution in this apparatus, training young farm men and women in home economics and agriculture and serving as a vital source of agricultural and domestic information. It was in these institutions that a dominant ideology for rural people was created and conveyed. As was noted in chapter two, ideologies contain both theoretical and practical components. The first step in analyzing rural ideologies in this period is to assess the theoretical categories of the relevant disciplines. This is the purpose of the next chapter.

FOUR

Theoretical Categories in the Dominant Ideology

The theoretical terrain of North American agrarian ideology was formulated and inhabited by subdisciplines or offshoots of broader areas of knowledge. Categories drawn from parent disciplines were adapted to interpret family farming and rural society. Bourgeois economics spawned agricultural economics, just as the former was making the transition from classical to neoclassical theory. Home economics combined early marginal utility theory, which was beginning to provide the most important theoretical concepts for agricultural economics, with scientific management, which was helping to define the production process as separate from the market and, therefore, as separate from the concerns of economists. Rural sociology, meanwhile developed as a subdiscipline of post-Spencerian sociology, in which society was redefined as an area to be investigated. Rural education, finally, was a hybrid of "new education," with its emphasis on the pedagogical importance of practical activity, and rural sociology. Together, these four emergent areas of enquiry determined dominant understanding of social reality in early-twentieth-century rural Manitoba.

Agricultural Economics

Agricultural economics was constituted as a distinct area of study at that point in the history of American economics when the marginal utility theorists such as John Bates Clark were resolving the conflict between classical economists and "new school" political economists. Richard Ely, who taught economics to agricultural economists at Wisconsin and whose texts were used at the Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC), was a leading proponent of new political economy. Thomas Nixon Carver, who was influenced by J.B. Clark, was the author of one of the first texts in agricultural economics and, later in his career, contributed to a modification of marginalism. Texts written by Ely, Carver, and Henry Taylor, a University of Wisconsin agricultural economist taught by Ely, defined the theoretical domain of agricultural economics as it was understood and taught in Manitoba between 1908 and 1925.

While a discussion of the meaning and significance of the emergence of marginalism in the context of the ostensibly conflicting visions of classical and historical economics is beyond the scope of this analysis, it is important to note the fundamental points of agreement among these approaches, and the characteristics which distinguished them. These three forms of economic enquiry were variants of bourgeois economics and, as such, accepted certain characteristics of a capitalist economy as given: commodity production, private property, a distinction between labour and capital and, central to the whole enterprise, the market. "New school" political economists challenged the extreme abstraction of the market in the classical schema by undertaking historical and statistical studies of

"real" (that is, historical) economies, arguing in the process there was a role for the state in regulating the market in the interests of a smoothly reproducing capitalism. Marginalists, meanwhile, had a different view of the market's operation than either the classical economists or the new political economists. For them, both the factors of the production market and the final goods market were interrelated and unified by consumer preference: the free consumer market of individual utility maximizers determined the economic realm. This emphasis on consumption distinguished marginalists from both classical and new-school economists who, employing Ricardian models, drew distinctions between input and output markets. For the latter, extra-market forces in the form of social classes limited market determination on the factor, or input, side. Marginalism, then, extended the determining power of the market, shifting focus from production to consumption, from supply to demand and, most importantly, from relations between classes of people to relations between people and goods. In the process a new law of value was defined, based on subjective consumer preference and displacing the labour theory of value.[1]

Richard Ely's *Elementary Principles of Economics*, first published in 1904 and used as an economics text at MAC, was informed by marginalism while retaining a residual historical perspective. Theory was central to *Elementary Principles*, but Ely prefaced his theoretical discussion with a historical account intended to illustrate the historical basis of contemporary conditions and institutions. He argued that fundamental ideas and institutions such as private property, the right to establish business enterprises and personal freedom, considered by some to be virtually natural phenomena, needed to be understood as historical creations. The purpose of economics for Ely was "to study analytically the process by which he [man] gets his living to-day, remembering that the process depends on certain fundamental conditions, and that these conditions have their roots far in the past."[2]

The analysis began with consumption which, governed by diminishing utility, marginal utility and demand, furnished the motive for production. A utility was anything that satisfied human want, marginal utility was the utility of the last good acquired or consumed before shifting consumption to some other good or commodity, and the law of diminishing utility stated that decreasing a stock of goods meant decreasing the utility per unit of the stock. Demand governed this process in that consumer choices were determined by the amount of the surplus of utility over cost; that is to say, individual consumers in the market attempted to maximize their utilities relative to price. It was market demand, then, that caused people to produce, and production was nothing more nor less than the creation of utilities through the application of mental and physical power to the physical universe.[3]

This application of power was called labour. Labour constituted one of the factors of production, while land (the physical universe) and capital (those intermediate products of the combination of land and labour that were used for further production) were the two other factors. Land and labour were primary and original factors of production, while capital was secondary or derived. Capital accumulation resulted from production over and above what was necessary in the present, postponement of consumption, and saving surplus product to employ in future production. The application of capital resulted in a more efficient combination of land and labour.[4]

Consumption guided production through utility preference, then, and production was sustained by the application of labour to land through the medium of capital. But it was the mechanism of exchange that was at the heart of Ely's economic theory: exchange constituted the market, bringing supply into contact with demand, and exchange constituted value. The term "value" had two meanings: subjective value and objective (or exchange) value. The former referred to the economic importance of a commodity unit to the one valuing it; the latter was a value ratio determined by comparing various subjective values with one another. In practice, exchange took place (and exchange values were established) in the market, which was simply the meeting of two or more minds entertaining different subjective values. Price was exchange value expressed in terms of money. It was fixed at the equilibrium between the subjective valuations of buyers and sellers. What was called market value was the price in any market at a given time, while normal value was an ideal towards which market values tended, standing at the point where marginal cost (the cost of production of the marginal producer) equalled marginal utility.[5]

Thus, value and price were constituted in a freely competitive market, governed by consumer demand for commodities. Income, meanwhile, was distributed among the three factors of production, and the entrepreneur who brought them together, according to both marginalist and nonmarginalist processes.[6] Following Ricardo, Ely stated that rent (the return to land) was determined differentially "by the extent to which the given natural agent or the given use of the agent surpasses in productiveness the poorest natural agent of the same sort or the least profitable use of such a natural agent that society requires to meet its demands for the product."[7] In other words, rent was the difference in productivity between the most marginal land in production and a given piece of land, assuming the most efficient production possible in the particular circumstance. Interest — the reward for the use of capital — was determined by the relation between the supply of capital and the demand for it. The demand for capital depended upon its marginal productivity: capital received in interest an amount equal to the value it produced at the margin. The supply of capital was dependent upon its cost of production; that is, the sacrifice the marginal saver or investor must undergo in postponing consumption. In a departure from marginalist categories Ely maintained that wages — the return to labour — were determined by bargaining, but within limits fixed by the product of labour and the costs of subsistence. The product of labour referred to the product of industry minus rent, interest and profits. Finally, profit referred to the differential return due to the ability or efficiency of the entrepreneur. It was the surplus left after the payment of wages, rent and interest, but not including "extra personal gains" which arose from monopoly or from chance. Ely ventured that profit, in fact, was similar to rent in the way it was constituted and determined. Both profit and rent were determined by differentials between marginal and superior land (in the case of rent) and entrepreneurial ability (in the case of profit). Hence it was possible to state that neither rent nor profit were *price determining* but, rather, both were *price determined*. Consequently, neither rent nor profit accounted for high commodity prices.[8]

The emergence of agricultural economics as a discipline represented the subordination of farm management and agronomy to academic economics in North American postsecondary education. It also marked the triumph of bourgeois economics in the analysis of family farming. Drawing on classical economics, North

American agricultural economists described the production and distribution of agricultural wealth in terms of a theory assuming a triad of classes, namely landlord, capitalist, and labourer. The relevant factors of production — land, labour, capital (and management) — were identified, and the division of agricultural income was described in terms of rent, wages, interest and profit. Furthermore, the historical approach in American economics produced a context in which a state regulatory role in the area of prices and marketing could be discussed. Marginal utility theory completely shifted the analytical focus from production to consumption and exchange, thereby giving the commodity-producing agricultural household an equal standing with the capitalist firm in the economy. The early agricultural economists followed economists such as Ely in the theoretical categories they employed. They differed in the extent to which the analysis of agricultural economics required a greater emphasis on management and market regulation.

"Value," wrote Henry Taylor in *Principles of Agricultural Economics*, "is at the bottom of all our considerations in agricultural economics. ... What we are needing as farmers is to learn how to adjust ourselves to price forces."[9] And what constituted value? According to T.N. Carver "value" meant exchange value, and it was determined on the basis of consumer want: "A concrete individual article ... has value only because it is wanted; and the more it is wanted in comparison with other things, the more value it will have."[10] Furthermore, every unit of a large supply of a given commodity was less wanted than each unit of a small supply because of the satiability of wants. As Carver said, this simply meant that if you gave people all they wanted of a certain thing they would not want any more; the more their wants were satisfied, the less intense their desire would become. Price, which was regulated by the forces determining demand and the conditions affecting supply, was simply the monetary standard through which value was expressed.[11] The impact of demand and price in agriculture is illustrated in Robert Murchie and Henry Grant's *Unused Lands in Manitoba*.[12] They noted that a favourable agricultural price level between 1916 and 1920 brought marginal lands into production, but with the price deflation of the early 1920s a considerable amount of marginal land was abandoned. In order for these "unused lands" to be resettled, according to Murchie and Grant, farmers had to build a buffer against the impact of the market by becoming more self-sufficient: "[t]he farmer needs to know a bit of gardening, fruit growing, dairying, stock raising, etc., if he is to perform the tasks involved in self and family maintenance."[13] Conrad Hammar, meanwhile, in a background paper for *Unused Lands*, invoked the concepts of "elasticity" and "inelasticity" to argue that market demand could solely guide resettlement if production was adjusted accordingly:

> The demand for wheat ... is inelastic and the amount taken from the market varies within comparatively narrow limits under ordinary conditions of supply. The price of such products, however, vary very widely, a shortage inducing a great rise in prices and a surplus a great fall. For products, the demand for which is elastic, on the other hand, the price changes due to changes in quantity supplied, are much less wide.[14]

In order to counter the effects of the dramatic price fluctuations associated with products such as wheat, commodities for which there was an elastic demand had to be produced on marginal land.

As Carver and Taylor revealed, agricultural production took place within this context of value and price. Carver began his analysis of the proper combination

of the factors of agricultural production by positing the law of diminishing returns, whereby that which was produced on a given piece of land "does not vary in the same proportion as the labor and capital, increasing in proportion as they increase and decreasing in proportion as they decrease, but rather ... the product increases and decreases less rapidly than these factors of production when the quantity of the factor, land, remains constant."[15] On this basis, he argued that labour and capital should be applied to land until the product of the last increment just covers the additional cost of capital and labour. Taylor, however, found this approach to be misconceived. He suggested Carver's method was misleading "for the simple reason that maximum profits per acre is inconsistent with maximum profits per unit of managerial activity in all cases except that of the marginal entrepreneur who is assumed to make no profit."[16] That is to say, it took no account of the fact that the application of extra capital and labour required extra managerial activity, which meant it did not sufficiently account for the differential profits that accrued to the more efficient farm managers. According to Taylor, the application of capital and labour to land operated according to a law of increasing returns "until a point of constant returns has been reached, after which the law of diminishing returns per succeeding unit commences to operate."[17] The optimum proportional combination of factors varied from farm to farm and from season to season. But with the aid of cost accounting, farm managers were able to determine the most profitable use of labour and capital throughout the year:

> This principle, when applied to the application of labor and capital to land, will doubtless result in applying sometimes more and sometimes less, but usually less to a given area than is called for by Professor Carver's rule of applying more and more until the product attributable to the last increment is just enough to pay the cost of the increment of labor and capital.[18]

It followed, then, that the farm manager was crucial for an efficient agricultural production.

In their analysis of income distribution in agriculture both Carver and Taylor followed the broad model of classical economics, with Taylor favouring an historical approach and Carver tending more to a marginalist method. In accounting for wage levels in agriculture Carver again invoked the law of diminishing returns, arguing that the demand and price for labour diminished as the number of units increased relative to the other factors of production. Successful farmers would "be hiring as many men as will, on the average, one season with another, produce a marginal product approximately equal to their wages. To hire more or fewer men would be to lose profits." Taylor, meanwhile, in a chapter entitled the "Human Factor" (which also contained his discussion of management), suggested that the differing physical, intellectual and moral qualities of men accounted for wage differentials.[19] There was more agreement on the question of interest, with Taylor invoking supply and demand to defend the rates charged by financial institutions and Carver explaining that interest accrued to the owner of capital equipment because of the service rendered by foregoing consumer goods in favour of capital investment. Similarly, in their respective discussions of rent, although Carver recorded some concern with Ricardo's differential theory, both agreed that rent was based upon marginal productivity. This meant the efficient farmer would apply labour and capital to land in such a way that the results of his superior ability would not be appropriated by the landlord in the form of rent, but would accrue to the farmer in the form of profit.[20]

The category profit, and its companion category management, provided the

fundamental link between agricultural economics and farm management as theoretical practices. "Farm management," wrote George Warren, "may be defined as the science of the organization and management of a farm enterprise for the purpose of securing the greatest continuous profit." Farm management specialists, however, had a somewhat different interpretation of profit than did the agricultural economists. Although they arrived at basically the same conclusions, they took different routes. Agricultural economists, closely following classical-*cum*-neoclassical economics, defined profit as the difference between a farmer's gross income and the total of rent, interest and wages, each accruing to the respective factors according to definite economic laws. In farm management, profit was determined through a simple cost accounting process. More importantly, though, it was considered to be part of labour income. By calculating the difference between farm expenses and farm receipts a farmer arrived at net farm income. His labour income was then determined by deducting from net farm income an amount equal to the interest on capital invested in the farm and an amount for unpaid family labour. This constituted his return for labour and for management. In some analyses there was no further distinction drawn between wages and profits. In others, an amount equal to a hired man's wages was deducted, representing the farmer's return for labour, while the remainder was interpreted as net farm profit.[21]

The calculation of profit on the basis of farm management surveys provided the space to discuss cost of production formulae and state intervention as means to regulate the market and stabilize farm income, thereby linking discussions of individual enterprises with broader economic structures. Both farm management specialists and agricultural economists addressed this question. Henry Grant rejected price fixing by regulatory bodies in favour of the adaptation of producer practice to market forces. "The producer," wrote Grant, "must learn to curtail production at the proper time and ... control it in the face of advancing prices" to guard against overproduction. Furthermore, commodity-based producer organizations could bring supply into a closer relation with demand: "[s]uch an organisation which extends its control to both the marketing of the product and the amount produced is in a position to obtain the facts of demand, [and] it can ascertain just how much the market will absorb at a given price and advise the producers accordingly."[22] Henry Taylor, meanwhile, endorsed price regulation. He rejected a cost of production formula calculated according to cost accounts, however, proposing instead a program based upon the alternative market choices of farmers. In so doing Taylor admitted that the market was a less than adequate determinant of value in North American agriculture. Commissions and regulatory bodies were useful, then, in redressing "the unequal bargaining power of great distributing corporations on the one hand and ... the isolated unorganized producers on the other."[23]

Subtle differences in the conception of profit should be understood in terms of the hierarchy of rural social science. Farm management was less theoretical than agricultural economics. This is evident in the organization of texts. Although Carver's *Principles* was not purely theoretical, containing as it did chapters on historical development and social context, the book was organized in terms of "the factors of agricultural production" and "the distribution of agricultural income." Warren's *Farm Management*, meanwhile, had a much more practical and interpellative tone, with chapter titles such as "Shall I Be a Farmer," "Types of Farming," "Farm Records and Accounts," and "Choosing and Buying a Farm." While

containing the agricultural economists' general categories, the farm management literature was addressed to farmers and their immediate problems. The distinctive factors of production were subordinated to the subjective unity of labour, management and capital in individual farmers. The task of agricultural economics was to deconstruct this unity to reveal the economic unity beneath its surface. The task of farm management was to use this reality to mediate the reconstitution of the unity for individual farmers on individual farms.

Home Economics

The histories of bourgeois economics and of home economics are inextricably linked. Both areas of knowledge emerged from the same source during the transition to capitalism; that is, from "domestic economy" or "rural economy." This political and economic discourse took household production, which was the main form of production in the early capitalist period, as its object of analysis. With the generalization of the capitalist market, however, the production of wealth shifted to specialized work sites, and households became increasingly limited to private, reproductive units exclusively controlled by women. The ideology giving intellectual coherence to these practices changed in the process. On the one hand, by the nineteenth century a distinct body of political economy literature existed focussing on "the wealth of nations" — capitalist production and market exchange. On the other hand, and by the same period, domestic economy had become limited to the nonproductive, nonmarket management of domestic formations, which were by then viewed as being separate from the "economy."[24]

Establishing the contours of what would later become home economics, mid-nineteenth-century American household instruction manuals were written within this inheritance, and within the more general ideological context of separate spheres. In the *American Woman's Home* (1869), for example, Harriet Beecher Stowe and Catharine Beecher offered an encyclopedia of advice on how women could find meaning and fulfillment through the management of their allotted sphere. Paradoxically, however, fulfillment could only be achieved by adapting the private world of women to the public world of men. Although the spheres were separate, a systematic economy required a systematic household: men had to be well fed, well rested and at their place of work at a specified time each day. An honourable and worthwhile housewifery, then, required a certain time discipline, orderly habits and the general organization of the household in accordance with the demands of the outside world. Although distinct from political economy, nineteenth-century domestic economy was nevertheless responsive to and dependent upon it.[25]

When it emerged as a distinct discipline at the end of the nineteenth century, home economics turned explicitly to political economy for its organizing categories. It ironically combined marginalism (which denied the significance of production in the formulation of value) with scientific management (which focussed on the production process). The various components of marginal utility theory — "an emphasis on demand rather than supply, a subjective theory of value to supplant labour-cost theories, an extension of the maximization principle from firms to households, [and] an interpretation of the consumer rather than the entrepreneur as the epitome of rational action," among others — pointed to the consuming housewife as the archetypal economic actor.[26] Indeed, in Philip Wicksteed's classic

exposition of marginalism, *Common Sense of Political Economy*, the homemaker was invoked to illustrate the universality of marginalist exchange:

> Whether our housewife is apportioning the stuffing of a goose at a table, or her housekeeping money in the market, or her time and attention between schemes for getting boarders and the more direct cultivation and furthering of the general tastes and interests of her life; and whether her husband is conducting family prayers, or posting up his books at the office, or weighing the advantages or disadvantages of a partial retirement from business ... they and all the people they are concerned with are alike engaged in administering resources, in developing opportunities and choosing between alternatives.[77]

Home economists embraced the marginalist model of the economy, recasting the household as a business firm defined by its consumption and demand function in the market. They then turned to scientific management to rethink the internal management of the household.

Christine Frederick, the most important theorist of early home economics, appropriated a set of five principles from the "efficiency engineers" to frame her analysis of domestic work and management. The first of these principles, ideals, was the guiding plan behind any business (profit in the capitalist enterprise). The second, standardized operations, conditions and practices, referred to the establishment of standardized and definite conditions for workers to follow. The third, despatching and scheduling, was an extension of standardization, whereby the when, how and best order of work were determined. The fourth, reliable records, encompassed the maintenance of accurate information, budgets and accounts. And the fifth, efficiency reward, referred to the benefits workers on the shop floor derived from scientific management (some of the monetary gains resulting from efficient work methods were shared with the workers, and the workers were happier when working efficiently). Efficiency engineers used these principles to guide their analysis and transformation of industrial workplaces. Frederick, and the home economists she influenced, believed the same principles could transform the domestic workplace as well. What were these domestic categories?

To begin with, the home was conceived of as a business enterprise in this schema. As a business enterprise in a marginalist economy, the consuming household was the central determinant of value. Value and price, the cost of distribution, the marketing and advertising of products — indeed all economic activity — were ultimately decided by demand strategies in individual households. The economic system was composed of a range of firms making rational decisions in response to market signals. If the system was to function efficiently, it was imperative that households act rationally in creating demand. As Frederick argued with respect to clothing material, irrational demand was the central impediment to an orderly textile market:

> The reason why clothing materials are so high is not because of tariff or high cost of manufacture — but because women are capricious and do not buy uniformly, and are swayed by hectic appeals or whims. If every manufacturer this moment knew within 15 percent just what and how, every woman would buy of the main supplies each year for three years, prices would come down with a thud, as much as 40 percent.[78]

Within the household firm, meanwhile, the various work areas were equivalent to the work environment of any artisanal or factory enterprise. In a chapter entitled

"The Household Laboratory," for example, Martha Foote Crow wrote, "the kitchen should be a combination of laboratory, machine shop and studio. The work done there is just as complex as that! ... The kitchen is not to be a place to which the housewife is condemned; ... it is a laboratory where science has sway." But the farm household was even *more* of a business enterprise than other households since it was actually a site of market production. In nonfarming occupations,

> the making and the keeping of the home, are a thing apart. ... But with the wife of the farmer, the woman's laboratory-machine shop-studio is not a little room by itself; it is a dynamo from which goes out the power for the whole machinery; it is itself a piece of elaborate machinery without which the rest of the cogs and bands and phlanges would all go awry and break into pieces, doing damage to the whole farm-factory.[29]

In both its external relations with the market and its internal organization, then, the domestic household was the equivalent of a capitalist firm.

But whereas the capitalist firm had profit as its goal, the household firm pursued specific familial ideals. These ideals varied between families, but generally they included the particular aims, tastes and strivings of the family in question. One of the most important ideals in all families, of course, was the raising of children. "It should indeed be part of the ideal cherished in the depths of every country girl's heart," wrote Foote Crow in *The American Country Girl*, "that she will, if possible, make to the world a contribution of children." "To present a completed, full grown, thoroughly efficient man or woman to the world," she continued, "is a contribution to the world's storehouse of power."[30] Yet even such an apparently noneconomic ideal as children had to be conceptualized using the categories of the firm and the market. For, as Frederick noted, children returned their own form of dividends:

> children can be looked on as "savings" or investment, and not as an expense. Healthy, efficient children represent a sentimental investment to their individual families; they are also the greatest social investment which can be made to the state and nation. We are just beginning to take this view as a community, that better babies, more sturdy and intelligent children, are investments to society.[31]

Raising children, and pursuing other family ideals, imposed a discipline on the enterprise that required the application of efficient management techniques.

In the organization of household labour, standardization oriented work towards time rather than the task, resulting in greater efficiency. Through the use of time-motion studies in cooking, cleaning, laundry and so on, both wasted time and the nervous fatigue caused by unsystematically jumping from one kind of work to another was allegedly to be eliminated. Furthermore, a standard practice for particular tasks could be devised, consisting of written instructions as to method and tools employed, the length of time the task should take, and the relationship of specific work processes to particular tools. Kitchen work, for example, was a series of interrelated processes involving, first, food preparation (collecting, preparing, cooking, and serving), and second, clearing away of dishes (removal, scraping, washing, and putting away). These processes could be standardized in such a way that each one was done exactly the same at each meal, with tools arranged to correspond with each step, taking a minimum amount of time and requiring minimal mental activity.[32] One of the main accomplishments of the factory was the breakdown of artisanal task orientation and its replacement by

time discipline; home economists were convinced a similar transformation could occur in the home.

With specific tasks standardized, all household work could be planned. This was the problem that despatching and scheduling addressed: "how to plan and work out a schedule of all tasks; how to relate work and apportion it so that it shall progress smoothly with as little interruption as possible." The order of work was determined, and then the time at which particular tasks were done was decided. Mental labour preceded manual labour in that, first, the absolute conditions around which the schedule must centre — meals, for example — were determined, and second, the order of regular daily tasks was decided on the basis of what worked best in a particular home. One possible morning schedule was to "wash all the breakfast dishes, straighten the kitchen, and start some cooking for lunch before going upstairs to make the beds... [while another was] to merely put away food and scrape the dishes, proceed to making the beds, doing light cleaning, and return to start lunch later, doing breakfast and lunch dishes together." The best plan for a particular household depended upon which was most time efficient in a given situation. Once a daily routine was established, weekly and special tasks could be fitted into a schedule. The purpose of the schedule was to prevent the "piling up" of tasks as a result of poor planning. "Without a schedule it too frequently happens that the worker allows an unexpected piece of work to interrupt and confuse her entire day." With planning, the unexpected could be easily fitted into the schedule. And finally, the scheduling of tasks had to include the scheduling of regular rest periods. As in other labour, the household schedule "should provide a short 'rest period' in the forenoon and a longer one in the afternoon."[33]

The household firm was linked with the external world through the purchases it made, and, according to Frederick, the key to efficient purchasing was knowledge. "It took manual labour and skill to supply... [family needs] fifty years ago;" she wrote, "but it takes more thought and intelligence to purchase ... by wise expenditure at the present day." In the case of food, for example, one needed to know how much value different foods possessed. In *The Cost of Food*, Ellen Richards showed that a variety of factors entered into the determination of cost. Seed, land rent, fertilizer, labour, machinery, interest on invested capital, waste due to rainy or dry seasons, market preparation, and the time and labour cost involved in table preparation all affected the eventual cost of food. An efficient consumption of any commodity, then, required a thorough knowledge of production and marketing costs. But efficient consumption was based upon knowledge of the difference between value and price. "Prices may fluctuate because of economic conditions," claimed Frederick, "but the value of an article can be fixed only in the consumer's mind." The distinction was crucial because on it hinged the health of the marketplace. By purchasing on the basis of value rather than price, consumers told manufacturers that they were willing to pay a standard price for quality merchandise, and they would not support unethical manufacturers who peddled an inferior product. "It is the largest manufacturers of standard, well advertised articles," Frederick suggested,

> who are on the right side of the food fence, and who are working with the housewife for better food conditions. ... The housewife must support the best manufacturers if she wants to encourage reliability, honesty, and purity in manufactured food products.[34]

Budgets and accounts both completed and coordinated the overall management system of the household. "It is necessary," wrote Frederick, "at the outset of running any business — to keep records of income received and income expended." Accounting stripped the emotional, unarticulated veneer off family relations to reveal and to elaborate the real calculations upon which they were based. After discussing one particular budgetary scheme, which included three separate accounts — "The Man's Personal Account," "The Woman's Personal Account," and "The Family Account" — Foote Crow suggested that such an arrangement allowed family members to view all budgetary questions "in the abstract, pure from every selfish impulse ... freed from prejudice, and in the dry light of reason." For Frederick, though, any system that was based upon an allowance for the household manager was unacceptable:

> I regard running the home as I regard running any business — with the wage earner as senior partner and the homemaker as junior partner. ... [But] I cannot imagine any business in which the senior partner would hand the junior partner [*sic*] and say, "Here, John, is some money; get some togs with it."[35]

An accounting problem peculiar to the domestic firm was how to "place a value upon the labor of the house administrator." As much as one wanted "the mother in the home to be the final unmerchantable thing there," her labour had to be valorized if accurate accounts were to be kept:

> where work is done by the woman administrator that a house servant, if one were employed, would be doing and would be paid for doing, the woman administrator, the mother in her function of housekeeper, should be paid in money at commercial rates for those services; and this should be accurately recorded day by day and week by week and taken full account of in the budget.

And furthermore, in the case of farm households, it was desirable that produce and goods that came from the farm rather than from the market be entered in the accounts "at market prices, as if they ... [came] from butcher and grocer." "This," Foote Crow said, "is the normal, systematic and efficient thing to do."[36]

For domestic labour, greater efficiency resulted in more leisure time; indeed, it meant the *creation* of leisure in the home. Just as the application of industrial processes to artisanal production in factories produced a division between work and leisure, a parallel application in the household yielded similar results. Furthermore, just as male working-class leisure was a problem for bourgeois society, the newly found leisure of homemakers created new ideological terrain. Scientific management separated the manual or physical area of homemaking into a discrete domain (the "mechanics of living," according to Frederick), leaving "three other and far more important ends of homemaking": providing a home atmosphere for husband and children; the homemaker's own physical, mental and spiritual development as a woman; and sharing in the larger home of community and nation.[37] By paying more attention to a husband's business, enhancing a child's cultural opportunities, taking one's values into the community, or developing and continuing cultural interests of one's own, women made effective use of their leisure time. But domestic labour, unlike industrial labour which did not control the work process, had both the power to create a division between work and leisure and the responsibility to use leisure time wisely. The creation of that division, in the pursuit of a family ideal, was inherent in the definition of the household as a business enterprise. The wise use of that time involved close attention to the nonmanual, nonphysical aspects of the reproduction of the family both within the household and in society.

Home economics adapted political economy to interpret the domestic sphere. It shared with agricultural economics an attentiveness to the household's external market activity, but it went beyond agricultural economics with its interest in the internal dynamics of the domestic household. Whereas agricultural economics, like its neoclassical parent, had virtually banished the production process from economic theory, home economics continued to draw theoretical links between the market and production.

Rural Sociology

The ideological role of rural sociology was determined by both the place of sociology in North American social science and the relationship of rural sociology to sociology and agricultural economics. The specific form that sociology took as an academic discipline was determined by the earlier claim of economics to an area of social knowledge and by the disagreement among sociologists as to how extensive their claim to expertise should be. As academic sociology took form in the 1890s, there were two visions of its place in social science. One foresaw sociology becoming a coordinating discipline that would synthesize the findings of economics, politics and jurisprudence to devise general laws in the tradition of Comte and Spencer. The other approach proposed that sociology organize basic social data and identify initial social principles which the specialized disciplines could then develop. Not surprisingly, sociologists came under attack, especially from economists, for their claim to be engaged in either a fundamental or synthetic exercise. Throughout the decade or so after 1895, sociologists, in reaction to this criticism, slowly refined their approach to focus on the social group and ideological community, and to rely less on grand evolutionary schemes.[33]

Rural sociology was constituted as part of the sociological rejection of classical political economy and the sociology that had been built upon it. Paralleling Ely's work in economics, sociologists such as Lester Ward, Albion Small and Edward Ross devised an alternative vision of society to rival the organicist, evolutionary and *laissez-faire* approach of Herbert Spencer's Social Darwinism. This new sociology accepted Spencer's naturalistic method — the observatory technique and the amassing of data in the tradition of Darwin — but turned it in a different direction. Whereas Spencer and the Spencerians perceived the social world as natural, governed by identifiable laws, and therefore beyond human intervention, Ward and his colleagues considered society to be unnatural and requiring human guidance. In this new view of the society, a naturalistic method could be used, not to identify social laws, but to identify social problems that could be addressed through social policy. The central social problem (expressed through studies of crime, delinquency, poverty and immigration) was the discovery, study and maintenance of moral or ideological community.[34]

Charles Ellwood's *Sociology and Modern Social Problems* (1910), used in sociology courses at MAC, was part of the new sociology. *Sociology and Modern Social Problems* was theoretically structured according to five categories: the origin of society, the process of social development, a theory of social order, a theory of social progress and the nature of society. In rejecting both contractual and organic interpretations, Ellwood argued that society originated spontaneously out of the fundamental necessities of the life process, namely reproduction and the procurement of food. Sexual reproduction and parental care gave rise to the family which,

in turn, was the basis of all regulatory and moral institutions. Indeed the family had a central role in society's institutional ensemble. Ellwood dichotomized human collectivities in terms of voluntary and involuntary groups, where the former were purposive (parties, trade unions, corporations) while the latter were what he called natural, community groupings (family, neighbourhood, the city, the nation); primary (intimate, personal, face-to-face relationships: family, neighbourhood) and secondary (not necessarily face-to-face relationships: state, political party) groups; and, finally, institutional (sanctioned by the larger community: family, property, church, school) and noninstitutional (unsanctioned, voluntarist formations for which no examples were given). In this constellation the family was unique in being both a primary, involuntary group and an institution. Moreover, it was the chief primary group since it controlled the birth and rearing of children, and it was the most important institution because, by involving a close association of both sexes and all ages, it was a microcosm of the problem of human relations — the "social problem." Furthermore, the family provided the link between the biological and the social in human society: it was through the family that the ultimate control of natural processes by mental processes was exercised.[40]

Social development and social change proceeded via adaptation and readaptation in relations between individuals. Social order entailed a settled and harmonious relationship among individuals or groups in society, and the problem of social order was the problem of maintaining this harmony. Order was maintained through the conscious exertion of social control. Institutions of control included government, law, religion, morality and education. In complex societies, however, the most important of these were the latter three. Government and law, being repressive mechanisms of control, did "not go deep enough to secure a type of social order which is adequate for modern social life."[41] Of religion, morality and education, education was the most effective mechanism of control because it controlled the formation of habit and character in individuals. Moreover, education was best suited to securing a *progressive* social order because it adapted the young to society before they fully participated in it. What constituted progress? Those changes "which secure a more harmonious adjustment of individuals to one another and a better adaptation of social groups to the requirements of their existence" were progressive. In this text, then, social life was ultimately "a psychical process, not, to be sure, in the sense that it is purely subjective, but in the sense that its significant and controlling elements are mental."[42]

It was as a subdiscipline of the new sociology that rural sociology was constituted as a distinct area of enquiry. The theoretical structure governing the analysis of rural society in this approach contained three elements or procedures: establishing a specifically rural space in sociology, defining the problems in the space, and identifying the mechanisms through which the problems could be solved and rural people could enter the ideological community. A close reading of John Gillette's *Constructive Rural Sociology* and some of Robert Murchie's Manitoba studies reveals how this structure operated in actual texts.

Space for rural sociology was established primarily through the classification of communities. In his delineation of associational forms, Ellwood suggested that those natural groupings (family, neighbourhood, city, state) which he termed involuntary groups were usually called communities and, more importantly, sociology was the study of community problems.[43] In establishing a claim for an area

of study, rural sociologists argued that distinctive characteristics distinguished rural communities. Gillette categorized urban and rural communities on the basis of factors such as population, function, associational life and "the density of group living." He then classified four types of rural communities: a "pure agricultural" type, based upon established, specialized agricultural production; a "mixed agricultural" type based upon established, generalized production; frontier communities; and backward communities. It was noted, however, that all rural communities were primarily or completely agricultural, close to nature, sparsely populated, and socially homogeneous.[44]

Murchie, following Gillette, used the survey method to define rural society and to establish the parameters of community. In the Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys, geographic community was determined on the basis of municipal borders.[45] Beyond this, various questionnaires specified the social phenomena under scrutiny, which were population, religious organization, schools and the attitudes of farm people to rural institutions. In the *Unused Lands* survey, population, national types, rural organizations and social services were identified in constituting an area of study.[46]

Defining the problems in rural society meant conceiving of it as an area of human intervention amenable to change through social organization, and identifying the socially integrative and disintegrative elements in a community. Gillette presented rural society as an interdependent network in which the conditions of farm people were determined by factors beyond their immediate control, but which could be affected through organization. Thus social analysts (and farm people themselves) had to recognize and cultivate the rural capacity for social action. Indeed, Gillette understood this in class terms:

> We are coming to a recognition that the farmers as such are a distinct and organic class in the national and international social mechanism, occupying a distinct place, having specific functions, with rights to obtain and defend, possessing characteristics by which they may be defined, and holding certain interests in common which constitutes [*sic*] a basis on which they may rise to class consciousness.[47]

But the purpose of this class agency was to ensure rural participation in the broader community, rather than to transform social relations. Agency presupposed an impetus to action, however. The impetus in this instance was the necessity of integrating rural society into a harmonious social order. What were deemed to be problems, then, were those institutions that were failing to perform this important task.

In Gillette's sociology people entered ideological community, and institutions facilitated that entry, through socialization. "The socialisation of a community," he wrote, "involves revolutionising its citizens' minds to its institutions and utilities."[48] To socialize an institution was to reconstruct it and make it amenable to the uses society demanded. The specific subordination of the individual and the local to the social proceeded through a number of avenues. Schools became social centres for the community and they became relevant to scientific agriculture and scientific homemaking. Churches began to act as social centres and as stimuli for rural improvements. Transportation and communication were improved to overcome rural isolation and put the country in touch with urban centres. Women's clubs helped keep the home in contact with the larger society so that women — "the great social factor" — were able to institute the reforms necessary for a

better community and social life.[49] Through these avenues and others, rural people became more conscious of their sociability, became more amenable to social control and, crucially, became active and willing participants in their adaptation to a broader social milieu.

In Murchie's work, problems were defined and solutions were proposed through an assessment of educational, economic, religious and social conditions. In the case of the Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys, the positive and negative features of the community were delineated. Community leadership was considered a problem in Turtle Mountain in that, although there was leadership in specific areas, there was little central community leadership "which is of such value in uniting the people in movements for rural betterment."[50] Localism, parochialism and opposition to reform were deemed to be problems. Activities that built community spirit and contributed to a sense of social unity were deemed socially progressive. Cooperative activity was progressive, and hence an ideologically cohesive factor, when it was broadly based. In Turtle Mountain cooperation was still largely economic, whereas in Swan River (and most other areas of rural Manitoba) it had moved beyond economics, fostering community spirit:

> The most striking thing, perhaps, in rural Manitoba for the student of sociology is the growing feeling of solidarity. ... Especially is Swan River remarkable in this regard: co-operative enterprises ... take the form ... of beef rings, livestock associations, farmers' elevators, co-operative stores, Boys and Girls' clubs, Home Economics societies, consolidated schools, and union Sunday schools. ... These co-operative endeavors are the best index to the social mind.[51]

In *Unused Lands*, marginal areas of the province which had not been integrated into the larger society were identified. Those lands that were adjacent to settled and stable regions were deemed to be the best areas for the formation of stable communities.

In "The Place of Play in the Country," which appeared in the *Grain Growers' Guide* in 1923, Murchie showed how a problem was identified and a solution was posed in one specific issue affecting rural communities. In this piece Murchie identified both an immediate and a more general problem. The immediate problem was the presence of professional players on community sports teams. The general problem was the development of the social instinct, the creation of community spirit and the making of good citizens. The first problem was a manifestation of the second in that properly directed recreation was essential in building good citizenship, community spirit and the social instinct. "Play in man and animals," Murchie wrote, "is an instinct that has served and does serve the purpose of education. By play we learn the business of life."[52] It was necessary, then, for rural communities to ensure there was ample opportunity for their members to participate in sports and recreation. Especially with the passage of the pioneer stage and the loss of the neighbourly spirit, it was argued, the recreational side of life needed to be organized, and the most important aspect of organization was the development of competent leadership and direction. There was a role for the professional or expert here (in the form of a school teacher, school inspector, or other such "community leader," *not* the professional sportsman), "but his role is to demonstrate and teach, to organize and to supervise, not to play our games for us while we roast or freeze on the sidelines."[53] To illustrate, Murchie referred to various community baseball leagues organized throughout Manitoba and to an

Interlake school inspector's use of organized play to assimilate Ukrainian children and youth. Recreation, in this context, was an integral part of the rural problem and its resolution. With the development of a more market-oriented agriculture, it was implied, a division between work and leisure had emerged and, with it, the growth of an athlete's labour market. Although neither of these market incursions was deemed to be a fundamental challenge to rural communities in this analysis, both created problems because they affected a community's ability to reproduce itself under changing conditions.

As a theoretical ideology, then, rural sociology was an investigatory discipline that conceived of rural society as a field requiring active intervention. Problems were identified and solutions were offered in order to ensure that rural people were part of the ideological community.

Rural Education

In defining their terrain, rural sociologists included the "rural school problem" as an issue that required social intervention. Given the nature of their enterprise — to identify problems in every area of rural society — this was hardly surprising. In reality, however, this particular aspect of rural sociology's domain was formed as much by educational as by sociological discourse. For at the same time that post-Spencerian sociology was developing in North America, what has variously been described as social education, progressive education and new education was becoming established in educational theory and pedagogical practice across North America and Europe. Associated with names such as Pestalozzi and Froebel in Europe, Dewey and Hall in the United States, and (pedagogically, if not theoretically) MacDonald and Robertson in Canada, this "movement" had a substantial impact on the organization of knowledge in school systems in general and rural schools in particular.

New education was composed of two essential components: a shift in focus from formal curriculum to the child and adolescent, and a curricular shift from classical to practical and scientific training. Both of these were the result of developments in educational theory that ranged from late-eighteenth-century European thought through to the emerging discipline of psychology in America at the turn of the twentieth century. Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827) viewed the child as a unity of moral, physical and intellectual powers, believing that education should involve all of a child's faculties. Teachers, he felt, should adapt instruction to the individual child so that these natural powers could be allowed free expression. In its actual practice, instruction involved the observation of actual items and natural objects rather than books and reading. Friedrich Froebel (working in the mid-nineteenth century) accepted Pestalozzi's conception of, and respect for, the child, arguing that children should be allowed to develop through free self and group activity. In formulating his notion of kindergarten and positing the significance of play in child development, Froebel argued that teachers should act as surrogate mothers, seeking to reproduce a feminine, familial atmosphere within the classroom. G. Stanley Hall, writing at the end of the century, drew on Darwin and evolutionism in proposing his general psychonomic law as a means of theorizing child development and, thereby, creating the new psychological category of adolescence. This law, also known as recapitulation, held that human beings, in their individual development, recapitulated the evolutionary development of the

species; this meant that physical life and individual behaviour went through clearly identifiable stages with each requiring special attention. What was especially new with Hall, in his three-volume study *Adolescence*, was his identification (now viewed as part of a historical invention) of particular characteristics of youth which required special care, protection and, most importantly, their removal from adult life. For pedagogy, all of this meant that educational systems needed to be judged on the basis of their adjustment to the perceived natural growth of individuals through the life stages.[54]

If Pestalozzi, Froebel and Hall (among others) established the foundations of new education, it was John Dewey who systematized thought in the area and gave it philosophical coherence. Dewey's primary contribution was to discuss education in terms of pragmatism and post-Spencerian social science. With the latter, Dewey developed a social conception of the mind and a view that education was essentially a social process. He attacked both idealism and realism for their individualism, arguing instead that mind and thought were the result of an active self interacting with an active social environment. Education had to recognize and reflect this relationship by viewing the child as an active being with impulses to communicate, create and investigate. The school, ultimately, had to be a social institution providing optimal conditions for the realization of social goals in this view. Pragmatism allowed Dewey to conceive of thinking as essentially an exercise in problem solving. In his philosophy, rather than mind discipline (classical humanism) or the reception of pre-established truths (rationalism), thought involved the application of the scientific method to problems. Education, therefore, had to involve students in situations where they solved problems of intrinsic interest to them. Students, that is, had to be both thinking and doing, or, more accurately, thinking *by* doing.[55]

The new rural education was part of new education *and* the rural social discourse linking agricultural economics, rural sociology and home economics. Institutionally it connected educational departments with agricultural colleges, provincial and state extension services, and the federal departments of agriculture. More importantly, though, it structured the circulation of educational ideology among rural people and rural ideology among children and youth. How, then, was the new rural education constituted? First, it was continuous with the rest of rural social science. The problematic of rural sociology was adapted to the educational milieu, and the categories of agricultural economics and home economics informed its development. Second, the categories of new education and rural social science were combined to produce an understanding of rural society in which education played a significant role and rural children and youth acquired identities through these categories. There were three elements in the constitution of rural education: establishing education as part of rural society, identifying the problems of rural education, and solving the rural school problem.

The first element consisted of three stages: establishing the existence of society, conceiving of education as part of it, and declaring an independence for education in society. Through this process education and educational systems were rendered areas of enquiry, and it became possible to generate and discuss social facts about education. The first stage merely involved an appropriation of social scientific categories, while in the second stage these categories were applied to education. The growth of literature on rural education in the first two decades of the twentieth century was itself an indication of efforts to consider the place of education in

rural society. But how did it actually proceed? In Albert Leake's *The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education* (1915), the need to train the young "in the science and art of modern industries and professions" was the departure point for a text organized in terms of education as a social phenomenon. One chapter on the historical development of agricultural education, and another on the conditions of rural life, introduced a more detailed survey of specific areas and issues in rural education. From a discussion of various levels in the system (elementary to college) through consolidation and rural school extension (clubs and short courses) to teacher training and the special needs of women, rural schooling and agricultural education were cast as social questions demanding social answers.[56] In *Rural Schools in Canada* (1913), meanwhile, J.C. Miller assessed the relation of Canadian educational systems to rural education in terms of administration and financing, teachers, courses of study, attendance, and the role of agricultural departments and agricultural colleges. He also analyzed the inspection and supervision of rural school systems, utilizing extensive questionnaires sent to inspectors across the country to survey working conditions, professional improvement, inspection methods, duties and patterns of appointment. Analytical methods and survey techniques gleaned from the social sciences framed Miller's investigation.[57]

In the third stage of this process the significance of specifically educational issues were noted. In James Robertson's *Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education*, for example, the *forms* of social analysis were given a content derived from the new pedagogy: the special needs and importance of children and youth in socialization, the role of practical training in the socialization of the young, and the significance of educational institutions in the wider socialization of rural people.[58] Form and content were then linked in the second and third elements of rural education.[59]

The second element was placing the problems of education in the context of the broader rural social problem. "The problem to be considered," Leake proclaimed in his introduction, "is how the agricultural land may be made to produce an adequate food supply for the rapidly growing population, while at the same time provision is made for such social and educational advantages as will induce the best of our country people to remain in the open country." Within these general contours, five subordinate problems were specified: developing a system of education suited to local conditions and to the everyday experiences of country children; adapting the education of boys and girls, fourteen to nineteen, to productive efficiency in agriculture and homemaking; giving serious consideration to the farm home; teaching sound business methods and scientific principles of farm management; and revitalizing and redirecting country life. These problems, in turn, were situated within the "conditions of rural life," namely the shift in population to the city caused by the introduction of machinery and the lack of opportunities in the country.[60] Rural education, then, as a distinct issue, was deemed to be in need of reform as part of the larger problem of rural society.

Methodologically, significant facts were generated in identifying the empirical validity of a rural school problem, and judgements were made on the basis of these facts. The "facts" of declining enrolment, poorly paid and poorly qualified teachers, inadequate management, curricula unsuited to the needs of rural people, and a generally poorer quality of education in the country than in the city were produced. These facts were then interpreted using the categories of rural

social science and educational theory. In the Royal Commission report, for example, the fact of rural population loss was presented, accompanied by four "undisputed" causal factors: the use of improved machinery, better education opportunities in towns, the freer circulation of money in the towns, and the attractiveness to young people of the amusements and excitement of town life. This was followed by four reasons why population should stay in the country: rural life created racial virility, agriculture created wealth without causing soil exhaustion, farming was a basis for national prosperity, and the cost of living in cities was a pressing problem. It was then posited that, whatever the movement of population, rural communities "are entitled to and must have education suited to the needs of all their members."[61]

The third and final element in rural education was the actual solution of the rural school problem. It was argued that education should and must perform a socializing and social control function, easing rural people — especially children and youth — into the ideological community. Once identified, then, the rural school problem required human intervention on a variety of fronts.

In the analysis offered by Robertson and the other commissioners, permanent teachers were needed in rural schools so they could be integral parts of the community, and the ideal agricultural teacher was a farmer with high community status. The practical courses in agriculture and homemaking, while important in transmitting needed skills, performed the useful function of preparing people for life in a rural community and developing good citizenship: "[the spirit and habit of good citizenship] may best [be] accomplished by the student participating in forms of activity which are part of the social life of the community and of the social and intellectual life of the school as an institution." The ideal school would become as much of a total institution for children and adolescents as possible. Their recreation would be brought increasingly under control, informed by an appreciation for rural life as both a buffer against the lure of the city and a further promotion of rural citizenship. At the specific level of practical pedagogy, children and adolescents would be trained in scientific reasoning and its application in their daily affairs. According to the commissioners, they would learn habits of observation, practical abilities from trial and experience, the habit of seeking empirical information, and "habits of forming reasoned judgements and opinions upon situations, conditions, theories, principles and methods of farm work and management."[62]

J.C. Miller considered organizational and administrative reforms to be necessary in solving the rural school problem. He used his detailed study to recommend changes that would improve the production and delivery of education in rural areas. In a chapter entitled "Agricultural Departments and Agricultural Colleges," for example, Miller described and analyzed the relationships among agricultural colleges, agricultural departments and departments of education. In so doing he prescribed an ideal articulation between the agricultural and the educational realms. In his mind these three areas, each of which contributed in its own way to rural education, needed to be more closely coordinated. Miller noted that, historically, agricultural departments were solely concerned with the commercial aspects of the agricultural industry, but departmental work in agricultural education was becoming more extensive (aid to Farmers' and Women's Institutes, for example). The most significant governmental work in the area of agricultural education was being done in the agricultural colleges, however. The organization, extension and diffusion of agricultural knowledge were undertaken

in these institutions. Provincial departments of education, meanwhile, were connected to agricultural departments and agricultural colleges through programs to train rural teachers in agriculture. Intellectuals in these various institutions were implored to cooperate in devising new publications and other media to serve those people who were no longer in school. It was especially important, he felt, to reach those young people who were between twelve and eighteen years of age through the adaptation of institutions and curricula to their special needs.[63]

According to Leake, the first step in solving the problem was improving the conditions of the rural school. Increased funding was necessary; thus, community members had to see the school as a profitable investment, efficiently creating a valuable product. Highly qualified (especially male) teachers were needed, and they could only be attracted by better salaries and other inducements. Material equipment had to be improved, and one method of doing this was to arrange community buildings in an educational block or community centre. "Here," he wrote,

> could be grouped the school, surrounded by ample grounds and gardens, the residence for the schoolmaster and his family, the church, the public assembly and music hall, the park, the athletic grounds, the skating rink, the co-operative creamery, the cheese factory, the bakery and the like.

Most importantly, though, the size of the administrative unit had to be enlarged through consolidation. The consolidation of schools — the basic element in the "complete reorganization of country life" — meant, ultimately, the consolidation of neighbourhoods: "what before consolidation were two or three separate neighborhoods become one strong organized community." Community was then reinforced through vocational training in agriculture and home economics. Practical education fulfilled the goals of both the new pedagogy and the new social analysis. Pedagogically it connected the school with real life, trained students to acquire information for themselves and cultivated active rather than reflective instincts. Socially it created a dutiful regard for "industry in general," fostered a respect for farm and home occupations, and served as a means of keeping boys and girls on the farm.[64]

Rural education provided a discursive link between the theoretical categories of rural social science, particularly rural sociology, and the innovative pedagogy associated with new education. In the process young people, and adolescents in particular (itself a new category), were assigned a special place in the analysis of rural society.

As an object of knowledge, rural social reality was structured according to these areas of analysis. Although related, the economy, the home, society and education were defined as discrete realms, each employing slightly different analytical categories. Between them, an abstract image of rural society was defined. It was in practical ideology, however, that these theoretical ideologies connected with actual human subjects to form social identities. At the practical level, the disciplinary boundaries dissolved into the subjective unity of individual farm men, women and young people.

FIVE

The Practical Creation of Dominant Agrarian Identities

The dominant gender and class identities of early-twentieth-century Manitoba farm people were forged within the categories of theoretical ideology described in the previous chapter. In the practical ideology of the period ideal images of farm women, men and young people were created. By the 1920s, when the rural social sciences were firmly established at MAC and the Extension Service was in place, a coherent language existed to address farm people as economic and social subjects. In the case of women and men, composite images were created around their economic activities in the farm enterprise and their social activities in the family and in the rural community. The farm man was, first of all, an efficient producer applying scientific methods learned, for the most part, through formal educational processes. Second, he was a market participant who adjusted his production and organized his enterprise according to the market. Third, he was a family head and community member who built a stable environment for his farm and home. The farm woman was a consumer and part-time market producer, a household manager and worker, and a subordinate business partner in her family and in the farm enterprise. In the rural community, meanwhile, she was a social housekeeper who had a duty to protect the farm family by cooperating with other women to solve social problems. For both women and men these various components produced professional identities: the professional farm homemaker on the one hand, and the professional farmer on the other. Images of farm youth as economic and social subjects active in the market and communities were constituted in this ideology as well, but young people were also viewed as being special agents in the general socialization and revitalization of rural life. This chapter sketches the contours of these images, suggesting what the various agrarian identities were in this discourse.

Men

In 1920 the *Grain Growers' Guide* published an advertisement for Seager Wheeler's *Profitable Grain Growing* and John Bracken's *Crop Production in Western Canada*, presenting the two authors as the agricultural equivalent of efficiency engineers in industry. Suggesting that the engineer "must combine the latest science and the most workable practice and apply them to solve the problems he meets," the advertisement offered the farmers of western Canada the hire of Wheeler and Bracken for $3.00 for life.[1] Although explicit use of the language of industrial efficiency was peculiar to the postwar years, the knowledge/production equation was common throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Speakers and participants in the farmers' institute meetings of the 1890s drew the connection closely, particularly in discussions of the depression in the early years of the decade.[2] The "Better Farming Trains" in 1912-14, sponsored

by the railways and conducted by the agricultural college, were designed to introduce farmers to better agricultural techniques in the interests of increasing production.[3] Generally, discussions of agricultural education from the late 1890s through the war years began with the premise that the most important factor in an enhanced productivity was for Manitoba farmers to have greater access to agricultural advice.[4]

A particular type of farmer was most successful in translating agricultural knowledge into a more productive and efficient farm. He was practically oriented, accepting the limits of nature while becoming a general expert in the various fields which bore upon agrarian life. He approached his work systematically, drawing upon scientific innovations while retaining past wisdom. Scientific farming, according to *The Farmers' Advocate*, was "simply farming in harmony with the laws which the great Architect ... has implanted in the soil, the air, the plants, and animals." Within this cosmic context, the successful farmer was a botanist in his knowledge of plant life, an architect or engineer in constructing a barn, an entomologist in combatting insects, and so forth across the many fields of agricultural knowledge.[5] Similarly, the Central Farmers' Institute in the 1890s conceived of the progressive farmer as one not brilliant but possessing common sense and good judgement, not highly educated but well informed, and not having great esteem but self-confidence.[6] With the systematization of knowledge in the agricultural college, this image of the producer became more tightly organized, yet the basic elements remained. In the curricular reorganization of 1919-20, the notion of the general expert was invoked to justify and explain the diversified Diploma Programme in Agriculture. "The typical farmer," it said, "is his own engineer, his own manager and worker, his own carpenter, and sometimes his own veterinary surgeon."[7]

While a systematic and general expertise could be partially built through received wisdom, the truly successful farmer was responsive to literature and thereby accepted the importance of formal education. Farmers had to accept the leadership of the colleges, institutes and extension service by reading and utilising their products. The editor of *The Farmers' Advocate* told the MAC constituency in 1915 that farm prosperity was based upon brainwork, meaning "the study of every available publication ... dealing with agriculture, the sorting out of information suitable for the farm and utilizing it in a definite system of farming."[8] This, in fact, was old advice which had been offered for the previous twenty-five years in Manitoba. In the institute approach, as we have seen, farmers presented papers using bulletins, books and agricultural newspapers as source material.[9] This method was never truly effective in reaching the "less progressive" farmer, however. The Extension Service was designed to overcome this problem, but even a well-organized lecturer's program faced many of the difficulties of the institute approach. In 1913 E. Ward Jones of MAC lamented that many Manitoba farmers did not take advantage of the educational material available to them, suggesting "these men ... do not often attend agricultural meetings, and, if they do attend, they make little effort to grasp the material being presented." For Jones the solution lay in the "up-to-date farmer," who attended meetings, carrying the message to his less progressive neighbours by example.[10] Two years later this role was largely appropriated with the initial appointment of district representatives who would work directly with farmers, combining scientific education with practical training.[11] Competition was an important element in the creation of an efficient agricultural producer. In the nineteenth century the agricultural

society fair (basically a livestock show) and plowing matches were the main media of producer competition. After the turn of the century, with the expansion of grain growing and the establishment of the Extension Service, Manitoba farmers were able to participate in various competitions, ranging from the traditional ones to summerfallow competitions and seed fairs. All of the competitions had a common purpose: to improve agricultural techniques and increase efficiency through friendly rivalry and the raising of community production standards. In the case of the plowing match, the model for other field competitions, the language used to legitimize it invoked science; through science, people's lives were improved in their home and community. By a simple enhancement of agricultural technique the plowing match produced better profits, an enthusiasm for farm life and a happier home. On a less modest though no less important scale, the seed grain and livestock fairs reproduced the market by serving as a meeting place for buyers and sellers.[12]

For his place in the market, the farmer acquired a sense of himself as an agricultural businessman. The categories generated in economics and agricultural economics — profit, demand, supply, production, consumption and so forth — were used here to address producers as economic actors. Farm men were identified first as producers *in* the market and second as businessmen *of* the market. The producer in the market had to understand its mechanisms and adjust his production to its demands. More importantly, though, the producer had to become part of the market as a manager and an entrepreneur. As an entrepreneur he participated in the wider economic world; as a manager he organized his enterprise in conformity with that world.

The first and most general element in a producer's market identity was a recognition of the dynamics of capitalism as an international system. In a representative text which appeared in the *Guide* during 1924, for example, Henry Grant sought to correct certain misconceptions concerning the economic situation of the day. He wanted to show farmers that the depression through which they were suffering was not peculiar to their own country nor was it a unique historical event. "It seems hardly creditable," wrote Grant, "that we should be so ignorant of world affairs as to believe that present conditions are the result of some inherent weakness in our own country." Rather, farmers "should realize that periods of depression and progress have an inevitable habit of recurring, and that from now on, the advent of good times should breed sane conservatism, and the arrival of depression bring fortitude and faith." And Grant went on to suggest that the farm man truly became a business *man* through his entry into the world market:

> The western farmer now realizes that he must produce for the world. He is no longer the slave of pioneer restrictions and rustic conventions. It exalts a man to be made a part of a world system, and the wholesomeness of great relations is meaning that the indolent, passive, vegetative farmer is giving place to the virile strenuous man.[13]

More specifically, the various components of the economy were conveyed in the agricultural economics courses taught at MAC. College examination papers suggested that such things as the role of supply and demand in agriculture,[14] the importance of the gold standard,[15] the advantages of the North American method of marketing grain crops (and the role of "middlemen" in that system),[16] the positive features of banking in a community,[17] and the place of capital and labour in the economy[18] were important themes.

The farmer *of* the market was a manager pursuing profit in his combination of

land, labour and capital, and an entrepreneur maximizing returns through different marketing strategies. The ideal farm manager viewed his farm as a firm functioning in a competitive marketplace. In the 1908 "Agronomy" examination at MAC, students were presented with the following question:

> Supposing you, on April 1st 1908 assumed the management of a farm of 640 acres that had not been managed previously at a profit, but which was considered to have the necessary equipment to make it pay. What important features would you at once consider, and why?[19]

When farm management became a distinct offering in the MAC agricultural economics curriculum in 1913, Warren's *Farm Management* (1911) was the text. In that and subsequent years (1913-17) farm management students studied the organization and management of a farm business, the various types of farming, farm size and the investment of capital in the enterprise, and the organization of labour on the farm.[20] In examinations during that period students were asked, for example, to "[e]xplain fully how you determine the 'Labor Income' of a given farm. a) Is there any relation between size of farm and Labor Income; or b) the amount of Capital invested in the Farm and Labor Income."[21] In later years these topics were supplemented by farmstead planning and, more importantly, assessments of farm management surveys and interpretations of survey results.[22]

The survey method, as was noted in chapter four, played a significant part in the development of cost accounting in North American farm management. Farm managers used farm management surveys to determine farm profitability. "It should be recognized," Alva Benton wrote in 1919,

> that the chief value of a farm management survey lies not so much in determining the actual income of farmers as in determining the principal factors which influence the profits secured. The amount of income that farmers make in any given locality varies from year to year with the crop yields received, and with the prevailing prices for farm products, but each year under the same conditions some farmers succeed better than others because their system of management takes into account factors entering into profitable farming.[23]

Accounting was part of MAC's farm management courses from 1913 onward. In examinations during March of 1914 students were asked, first, to give "a concise plan for keeping the farm records and accounts" and, second, "[h]ow would you proceed to introduce a system of cost accounting in order to determine the standing of different enterprises?"[24] By 1916, the agricultural economics curriculum included a separate "Farm Business and Accounting" course in which the "general principles of business, the use of commercial paper... [and] systems of cost accounting and records" were taught.[25] Students who wrote the "Farm Accounts" examination in 1919 were asked "[w]hat records are necessary to find the profit or loss on a certain crop or livestock enterprise?" They were also asked to calculate "the Labor Income of a farmer from the following data: Average inventory, $25,000; Total receipts, $3,000; Total expenses, $1,000; rate of interest, 5%."[26]

The entrepreneurial farmer actively participated in the market, pursuing various marketing strategies for his grain and livestock. Marketing courses at MAC taught agricultural students how to understand the market and participate fully in it. The first specifically marketing course offered at the college, in 1912-13, included the following topics:

> How the price is affected by supply and demand, by communication, transportation, competition, exportation and visible supply. The inspection of grain in

accordance with the Manitoba Grain Act. Sample markets; systems of marketing grain.

"This course," it was noted, "will include a visit to the Grain Exchange, the grain inspector's office and the flour, oatmeal and linseed oil mills." "Principles of Marketing," offered in 1925-26, involved "analyses of market functions, marketing channels and marketing agencies with special reference to storing, grading and market financing of farm products."[27] In the examinations set for marketing courses, students were asked to identify the components of the grain trade, as in this example from 1915:

a) Define the following terms as applied to the speculative wheat market: "Bull Speculator"; "Bear Speculator"; "Long" and "Short"; and "Put" and "Call";
b) What is meant by "cash" or "spot" wheat.

Or, they were asked to solve marketing problems like those contained in the following scenario:

Mr. J.R. Dutton of Gilbert Plains shipped to his own order at Port Arthur one car of wheat weighing 60,000 pounds, which graded No. 1 Northern with a dockage of 1%. The car arrived at Fort William on September 15th and the grain was stored in the terminal elevator until October 30th, when he sold it through the Grain Growers' Grain Company for $1.00 per bushel. The freight rate from Gilbert Plains to Fort William is 15 cents per 100 pounds. Interest rate is 6%.
a) What amount did he pay for storage?
b) What amount did he pay the CNR?
c) On the form provided make out the account sales rendered to Mr. Dutton by the Grain Growers' Grain Company.[28]

As the reference to the Grain Growers' Grain Company in the above quote suggests, cooperation was an important marketing option for farmers. By 1914-15, cooperative marketing was being taught as a component of agricultural economics and, in the "Rural Economics" courses offered after 1916, the subject of agricultural cooperation ("its history, co-operative legislation, formation of co-operative organisations, scope of agricultural co-operation") accounted for about one-third of the subject matter.[29] By 1925-26, there was a separate "Principles of Co-operation" course involving an "intensive study of motives, methods of organisation and business management of co-operative associations." In examinations during the fall of 1925, students were asked to "[s]tate and explain the two general groups of co-operative organization from the standpoint of form of organization followed" and to "[d]iscuss the results of overenthusiastic and extravagant claims."[30]

As a 1925 extension bulletin illustrates, however, the subject of cooperative marketing was constrained within acceptable limits in this discourse. In his introduction to the bulletin, John Bracken wrote:

To those who are starting in co-operative enterprise, it should be emphasized that co-operation of itself carries with it no miraculous solution for our problems of marketing: we must produce what the market demands and produce more efficiently than our competitors. Producer organizations, whether co-operative or otherwise, cannot evade the laws of economics and business. They can do a great deal, however, towards standardizing production, eliminating wastes in marketing, and providing new markets.

In the main text of the bulletin, Henry Grant enumerated the benefits which

would accrue from adopting cooperative methods, notably efficient action in the market and the creation of a market mentality. The four "Possibilities of Co-operative Marketing" that he listed were "1. Standardizing and improving education, 2. Regulating the flow to market, 3. Improving the distribution between markets, 4. Developing new markets." Much less important was the development of cooperative ideals. The seventh and last item in a list entitled "What should a co-operative member do?" was "Develop an intelligent understanding of the meaning of co-operation," well below "Eliminate excess varieties and improve his products" and "Make intelligent use of market information."[31] Hence, cooperation was a marketing option that the market-wise farmer could use in pursuit of a better return on his investment.

But the farm was something more than a capitalist firm; it was also the material foundation of family and home. The farmer had to operate his farm as a business while using it to create a family environment. The task of providing material support for the family was accomplished by being a good farmer. So the farmer who produced efficiently, and managed his farm as a business, was serving his family well. But the creation and maintenance of a solid family environment was a more difficult process. Physically, it meant organizing an attractive farmstead. An ideal farmstead included a treelined avenue from the main road directly to the house, a shelterbelt on the north and west, a lawn inside the shelterbelt and around the house, beds of flowers, and a space "for such enjoyable summer games as tennis, croquet, and like pastimes." Such a comfortable and pleasant environment provided a context for "father and mother, sisters and brothers [to] gather together." By making the home "magnetic and attractive" in this way, the farm man did his duty to family and community.[32] In his domestic relationship, meanwhile, he treated his wife as a partner in the farm, leaving her alone to manage her own department in the enterprise. The "only way that seems to work out in terms of cash profit for both of them," Margaret Phillips argued in 1923, "is when certain departments of the farm are called John's and Mary's and each carries the responsibility of seeing that work is accomplished." In this vision, the traditional patriarch gave way to the benevolent patriarch. He was still firmly in control but in a managerial rather than a paternal sense. On the traditional farm, "John plans and bosses everything and Mary just does the jobs he assigns her," but on the properly managed farm:

> the independent Mary will tell John that while he can boss all the broad acres and plant them to his own joy and wisdom, she craves a few square feet to dig and delve all her own way, and, if she so desires, plant acorns and peanuts without interference.

Just like horses in a tandem team, "John may lead the load, but Mary surely does her share of the pulling."[33]

To complement his private face as a benevolent patriarch, the first component of a farm man's public face was service to the community through active participation in community organizations. Community service meant breaking down individual, familial and rural isolation in the interests of a broader community and rural stability. So the farm man, in the interests of nonsectarianism and communitywide endeavour, became active in agricultural societies, farmers' institutes, grain growers' associations, United Farmers of Manitoba clubs and similar groups.

Descriptions of two community movements which developed in the late 1910s

and early 1920s convey this vision of service. The first, consisting of community clubs, took form in the immediate postwar period under the auspices of the Social Service Council of Manitoba. Its purpose was to organize whole communities — grain growers' associations, business groups, churches — "to put on a program of community activities through which life in the country may become more wholesome, more attractive, and more complete."[34] The second, called the district builder movement, was formed in the face of southwestern Manitoba crop failures in the 1920s. Those involved in the movement saw the solution to the "unprofitability" of farming as residing in pan-community activity. The organizational method used was to form committees of farmer-experts (farmers who had made a financial success of their own farms) who then shared their expertise with their neighbours. In this way, solutions were forged in the community, "directed toward community betterment" and drawing upon "the inspirational forces which every community possesses," while simplistic analyses which blamed the banks, the tariff, the grain trade or the railways for people's woes were rejected.[35] The man who participated in these organizations, in whatever capacity, was performing a service to his community.

The ideal farm man played a leadership role in his community. The MAC graduate, in particular, bore a great deal of responsibility for rural leadership. To begin with, he was specifically trained for this task through the "rural leadership" courses which were part of the rural sociology curriculum by 1919. In these courses, he studied "some of the practical problems of rural life in Western Canada... [and the] methods of redirecting rural social life."[36] After graduation, if he chose to farm, he returned to his own or another rural district prepared to socialize the community (in the sociological sense discussed in chapter four):

> By his words and deeds he should spiritually, morally and economically help his less fortunate brother. ... An agricultural student, having studied rural sociology ... can and should perform a great work in his rural district by the organization of boys' and girls' clubs, agricultural meetings, dramatic and other social organizations.[37]

He and other farm men were taught how to establish rural values and better farming techniques through the MAC short courses.[38] If he did not choose farming as his vocation, there were many other opportunities in rural leadership open to the "college man." These included:

> teaching or supervising the teaching of agriculture; scientific investigations ... in government stations; rural landscape improvement; agricultural experts or county agents; agricultural police duty, including inspectors of all sorts; organization of co-operative societies; agricultural advisers in employ of railways, chambers of commerce, etc.; representative of commercial organizations, i.e., farm machinery, canning industries, dairy supply houses; rural YMCA work; [and] rural civic improvement.[39]

The enlightened rural man could, through effective leadership, facilitate the creation of community.

Effective rural leadership yielded the cooperative rural citizen. The "redirection of social life" or the "socialization of rural communities" meant imbuing rural areas with a spirit of cooperation. As rural people were drawn out of their isolation and into associations, they learned to be cooperative. "Associational life," John Gillette wrote, "is desirable for social solidarity: local pride and community

devotion must be to small communities what patriotism is to nations." And, G.W. Fiske added, "the greatest need of the rural community is co-operation. ... Success in business co-operation can lead to plans for social co-operation ... in home, church, [and] school."[40] According to the author of a MAC extension bulletin that addressed the issue of Boys' and Girls' Clubs, "the best results will be accomplished only when the whole community, including the churches, homes and the various farmers' and women's organizations, co-operate with the school in lending dignity and sympathy to the movement."[41] Professor T.J. Harrison of MAC claimed the solution to rural social problems depended upon two things: "co-operative or community movements among farmers, and ... the co-operation of the community with the government and rural leaders."[42] To cooperate was to overcome social divisiveness in the interests of a wider harmony.

The image of professionalism was constantly invoked in this ideology. It was used to create a status for farmers in which they identified themselves as equal to traditional middle-class professionals, notably doctors and lawyers. The professional farmer was a perfect combination of efficient producer and manager, the skillful market player, and the solid family and community man.

The first and major aspect of any profession was a body of exclusive knowledge that was acquired through specialized training. MAC, especially in the Agriculture Diploma Programme, was the training ground for Manitoba farmers. Just like other professional students, the agriculture student studied a varied curriculum of specialized courses. He learned the precise details of crop and livestock production, proper methods of farm management and marketing, and a systematic approach to rural leadership and community betterment. Upon graduation, students were "practical, intelligent successful farmers, and good citizens" with the skills required to make a positive contribution to rural life; furthermore, they had acquired the scientific knowledge and the business ability to engage in the increasingly complex "business of farming."[43] The farmer who was to succeed needed this training, and the farmer who lacked it was something less than a professional. The proponents and defenders of agricultural education, who were often faced with a skeptical farming population, invoked professionalism in their defence. In addressing the UFM convention in 1925, for example, Professor C. Hopper of MAC made the following argument:

> farming is an important business and is a difficult business. I think you will admit that in both these respects it will measure up with the business of the lawyer, the banker or the teacher. ... Theory and practical experience alike point to the same conclusion, such a life business as farming requires and abundantly repays special training bestowed upon it. The man who contends that a good education is not helpful in farming is hurting his own profession.[44]

If, on the one hand, farming was to prove its social worth or, on the other hand, farmers were to weather the vagaries of uncertain markets and an uncaring nature, the farm man had to embark upon a program of special training and, in the process, become professionalized.

The true professional had the best livestock, crops, machinery and seed, kept a well-maintained farmstead, made regular improvements to roads and fences, and followed an enlightened yet cost-effective management plan. Professionalism meant "good farming," and the good farming competition was designed to reward farmers who set a professional standard in their community. Based upon

the assumption that agriculture was a permanent profession, the competition judged and assessed the various components of an operation with a view to rewarding the farmer who transcended the mere acquisition of wealth, exuding an air of stability and longevity.[45] Furthermore, the fact that farmers had to master so many areas of endeavour was an indication of their professional status. "It should be evident to all," wrote Fiske in *Challenge of the Country*,

> that agriculture today is thoroughly scientific when rightly practiced, which is simply saying that the practice of the new agriculture is *a profession*. It is among the most difficult and highly technical of all professions. No profession, with the possible exception of medicine, has a broader scientific basis.[46]

Moreover, a failure to acquire scientific knowledge was deemed by some to be tantamount to unprofessional behaviour. "What would we think of a doctor," D.F. Wilson asked rhetorically in an 1893 plea for greater agricultural knowledge, "who knows as little of his profession as we do of ours?"[47]

The ideal farm man, then, identified with the professional and bourgeois elements in society. As an economic actor he was the same as any other businessman or entrepreneur with whom he shared the market, and as a social actor he had a status equal to that of any other man in the local or national community.

Women

As the crucial actor in the consumer economy, purchasing approximately three-quarters of all products bought for the home, the farm woman needed to be a trained and efficient consumer. She was the "purchasing agent" for her firm. Whereas in the nineteenth century she had been a manufacturer, producing goods for her family, in the twentieth century she was the "director of consumption" who, according to one MAC graduate, "must select ... from among goods made under the supervision of those more deeply interested in profits than in quality or usefulness." Hence, she had to be knowledgeable. The changes in modern industry had not relieved the housewife of the burden of supplying the needs of her family; rather, "in becoming the purchasing agent of her family and society she has larger responsibilities [than in the past] calling for trained intelligence, knowledge and constant vigilance."[48] As the following examination questions illustrate, that responsibility was great indeed. In the MAC course "Economics of the Household" (1918) students were asked, "In what ways may it be true that the housewife is responsible for the high cost of living?" In the same course the following year they were asked, "In how far [*sic*] can an intelligent demand control the market?"[49] Hence, farm women learned the terrain of the marginalist economy, including the role of consumption, the effect of demand, and the relative value and merits of various manufactured products (such as trademarks and labels: "[e]very householder should remember that when companies ... spend huge sums in advertising these goods, they are practically guaranteeing their quality").[50] Furthermore, as a consumer she had a responsibility for the well being of her community. If women sent their money out of the community "to build up large centres," as many did, it meant "deserted towns," "vacated farms," and a loss to the community of thousands of dollars. To neglect her responsibility and training was to be a poor mother, a poor wife, and a poor citizen.[51]

Farm women were not simply consumers, however. They also had a productive link to the market. Women continued to perform production functions on

Manitoba farms well into the twentieth century, and many continue to perform some of the traditional functions to this day. But with the institutional expression of home economics in the first two decades of the century, this work became overlaid with the language of the new disciplines. From the mid-nineteenth century, a public forum for women's production existed in the form of horticultural shows at the agricultural society fairs, where women competitively displayed fruit, vegetables, canned and pickled products, and flowers. But, in a move that contributed to the formation of home economics societies around 1910, fairs came under attack as being out of touch with the needs of women. What eventually emerged was a system of fairs integrated with the extension service, in which production for domestic use was linked to production for market exchange.[52] In the home economics program at MAC, courses were given instructing women in those aspects of the market that were of direct relevance to them in their role as goods producers. In "Poultry," for example, home economics students heard lectures on the following subjects: "artificial and natural incubation and brooding, feeding and rearing chickens; feed and care of ducks, geese and turkeys; poultry diseases; market eggs; marketing poultry products."[53]

As a manager, the ideal farm woman applied the rules of capitalist efficiency and scientific management to her household. She followed a business model in coordinating and combining her consumer and producer activities. In the area of budgets and accounts, for example, the Manitoba Department of Agriculture bulletin "Financing the Farm Home" addressed the woman in the home as a financial manager and household accountant. The text began by establishing the legitimacy of a woman's control over the area of household management. Through a discussion of various plans for disbursing the family income (drawn from Christine Frederick), women were described as equal partners with men. "When a man can trust his wife with his name, his honor, and to be the mother of his children, surely he can trust her to be an equal partner in the business of the home," proclaimed the bulletin's authors. The overall planning of the household budget fell to women and, as the household accountants, they, like accountants in other businesses, "keep a careful record of all money spent and all received, this being their only way of knowing whether the company is running at a gain or a loss." The farm accountant had to calculate more than just monies spent and received; she also had to include in her accounts the exchange value of food and clothing used for domestic use, and the exchange value of the farm family's living accommodation:

> To arrive at an estimate of the cost of running a farm home, one must charge one's self with this produce. When the potatoes are put in the cellar in the fall, the whole quantity may be charged at one time. In the same way, when animals are killed for home consumption, record of their weight and value should be entered in the accounts. It is somewhat more difficult to deal with the milk and vegetables, but their value may be estimated and charged. ... In the receipts column one should enter any cash received for produce sold and any received otherwise, and the value of home products consumed, and an estimated amount for rent.

Then, in her role as financial manager, the homemaker used her accounts from one year to budget for the next. But here she entered into discussions with the "senior partner" of the firm, planning a budget which he, she and the other family members were able to follow.[54] All women experienced their activity as an extension of exchange relations in this ideology. Adopting a management system,

of which household accounts were a significant part, meant applying a business perspective to the home and its place in the economy. And, in the specific case of farm women, the nonmarket goods production in which they were engaged was subordinated to exchange through their identity as accountants and managers.

In her relation to housework, the homemaker was addressed as the manager of the domestic labour process. According to Martha Foote Crow,

> the woman in the heart of the farmstead is her own route-clerk, and order-of-work clerk; she is her own instruction-card clerk, time-and-cost clerk, gang boss, speed boss, repair boss and inspector. All these and much more she must be in order to gain the effects of scientific management in that factory which is her home realm.

The household manager was responsible for transforming the traditional household, which had existed unchanged for centuries, into a home in step with the times. "If the wife of Julius Caesar could step into the home of the farm today," Mrs R. Whiteside wrote in 1922, "she would find nothing to confuse her, but if Julius Caesar were to come to the modern farm he would not be able to operate any one of the labor saving machines which have replaced old methods of farming." In one important area, for example, the manager could use Frederick's techniques to change the old, roomy, multipurpose farm kitchen into a small compact workspace with logically arranged equipment. Whiteside advised homemakers to "use the same intelligence in running the home that is necessary to make other great enterprises a success. Saving steps means saving time, strength, energy and health. It means comfort and enjoyment, thus lifting housework above drudgery."[55]

Equally important, though, the homemaker was addressed as a worker — specifically the efficient, disciplined and happy worker ideally created by scientific management — through her relation to housework and motherhood. The "Better Babies Movement" of the first two decades of the twentieth century, for example, sought to create efficient and expert mothers through the organization of conferences and baby shows in which women learned the correct processes of child care.[56] It was the MAC-trained mother and housewife, however, who was the archetypal rural domestic worker. Her experiences were both a confirmation of the validity of household management and an example to other women. One college graduate pointed to her training in "House Planning" as having been invaluable in facilitating her domestic labour:

> The house well planned is the first thing to lighten housekeeping duties, and our little house, although small, has been planned to save steps, make the work easier, and there is no waste space. Had I embarked upon the adventure of marriage and housekeeping without some knowledge of house planning I should probably be working in a very unhandy, poorly planned house.

For another graduate, the college experience of "working in a well equipped kitchen or laundry with porcelain top tables and sinks, hot and cold water on tap, hardwood floors to clean, nice refrigerators, gas or electricity with which to cook, and stools to sit on at much of our work" gave her "higher ideals in life and a broader outlook":

> I have just been married three years. ... I have a good sized house to keep, two men besides my husband to cook for, a little girl two years old and a baby five months. We have a lot of visitors and go out quite a bit ourselves. I do all the

> sewing for myself and my children so I never feel time dragging, but can keep up with each season's work, and am not often very tired mentally or physically.

Echoing these sentiments, Mrs. R. Clark suggested that the most valuable aspect of her training had to do with "the attitude of the worker in her home to her work. The student at the college is made to feel and understand that the work of making and keeping a home requires system, art, business ability, energy, perception for details, that it need not seem to be just a haphazard conglomeration of jobs."[57]

While her specific domain was in the home, the farm woman was part of a larger enterprise. Her work, and the approach she adopted to her work, contributed to the success or failure of the farm. Whereas it was required of men that they provide an environment for home building, a crucial component of the farm woman's identity was a clear understanding of her role as an intelligent and capable, though subordinate, partner in the farm. Partnership entailed managing her domain not simply as a small capitalist firm, but as the important department of a large firm. With the woman in her department and the man in his, both being as efficient as possible, "happiness and self-respect spur them on to greater labors and accomplishments, and love and sympathy ... make a fine harness to help pull the load with joy."[58] The philosophy underlying MAC as an institution was in fact based upon this notion of partnership. Home economics complemented agriculture in the creation of the symmetrical farm family. "With the advance of agricultural training in any community," wrote the MAC administrators in 1920,

> comes the demand for scientific and practical education in the chief of all industries for women — that of homemaking. ... [T]o fit young women of the Canadian West for the great work which devolves upon them in the development of the country, and to give them an intelligent working knowledge of those things which are vital in their work in the home, the course in Home Economics has been planned.

In this program, instruction was given:

> in the fundamental principles and practice of domestic science, including the study of foods and cooking, the interior and exterior surroundings of the healthful home and its management; the health and general well being of its inmates; the study of textiles and fabrics; the making of women's and children's clothing and millinery; and also instruction in dairying, horticulture and poultry raising.[59]

The woman thus trained could take her place as a scientific homemaker alongside a scientific farmer, building a "better home" and a "better farm." "A real man's wife," wrote Esther Thompson in 1918, "must be something more than his housekeeper and mother of his children. She must be his companion — one who understands him and can fully enter into his life, giving sympathy and inspiration." Her nurturing, caring qualities had the effect of domesticating the pure pursuit of wealth in agriculture, transforming the farm from an economic to a familial and social unit.[60]

The farm woman's social identity was based upon her homemaking role and was expressed through male language and institutional models. As the custodian of the farm family, she was propelled into community activity. But her experience in the home did not equip her for public discourse. She therefore relied upon the language and institutions used by men and designed for their purposes. The image of women in this ideology was constituted through the same categories as men — social cooperators and community leaders — but it was expressed

through the ideology of homemaking. The ideal farm woman became a forceful and self-confident public actor, but within the limiting and subordinate roles of community homemaker and social housekeeper.

MAC-trained farm women, and those farm women who participated in extension lectures and short courses, were expected to play community leadership roles. Both home economics and agriculture students were given instruction in rural leadership at the college, but for women this was supplemented by courses in the "History of Home Life" and "Social History" which taught the fundamental significance of family and home in historical development. "Women who have had the advantage of special training," wrote Nellie McClung in 1916, "have a heavy responsibility. ... They must lead in new avenues, putting higher value on woman's work." As community leaders, farm women organized and facilitated various female and youth activities in their district, ensuring that stable families and homes were integral elements in an uplifted social life and a new rural civilization. Voluntary leadership provided a link between state institutions and specific communities, especially prior to the introduction (and in the absence) of home demonstration agents.[61]

By participating in Home Economics Societies and Women's Institutes, women not only learned household skills, but they also acquired a social identity. In the discussion following the presentation of papers at institute meetings, for example,

> [s]olutions would be found for many difficult problems now confronting many timid and shrinking women. Encouragement and sympathy would relieve the stress of many lonely situations. A better and therefore a higher knowledge of her sister-women would be gained, reflecting a warmer friendliness and deeper kinship with mankind.

Participants thus developed social skills "that were dormant, and as a result — they are better fitted for homemaking, motherhood and citizenship." And a social identity gave the homemaker the ability to create a truly home atmosphere for her family:

> There is more than manual labour to be done if there is to be a real home. The mother must radiate cheerfulness, hope, faith, and again faith. She must generate energy and emulation and perseverance. She must lead and yet appear to trail behind. *How shall she do all these without human association and interchange of ideas with her sisters?*[62]

Social cooperation for women meant working together to protect and enhance the home, while contributing womanly skills to the general stability of the community. Like male cooperation, it was directed towards breaking down isolation and sectarianism in the interests of a wider community. When Mary Speechly arrived in Pilot Mound from England in 1902, for example, she encountered a social life which was organized around the churches, with little contact beyond one's church group and little contact between farm women and women in town. After it was launched in 1911, the Home Economics Society set about to overcome sectarian and partisan barriers, freeing people from the "petty ideas" separating neighbours, towns, and rural districts by "encouraging sociability among its members and ... work[ing] for the social, moral and educational betterment of the home, the community and the nation."[63] In the Home Economics Societies and Women's Institutes, "a fine spirit of co-operation [was] aroused" as town women and farm women met and worked together. Furthermore, extension lecturers and home

demonstration agents not only instructed girls and women "in dressmaking, millinery, cooking, etc.," but they also assisted them "in developing co-operative effort in connection with the Boys' and Girls' Clubs, Women's Institutes, United Farm Women, etc." Through their collective endeavours and the guidance of the extension service, women built "better homes, better schools, better health, better roads, better farms, and better laws" in the societies and institutes.[64]

The cooperative activities of society and institute women ranged from community through provincial to national concerns. In the local community, they sought improved school conditions, Boys' and Girls' Clubs, town rest rooms for farm women, community libraries, medical inspections and improved medical facilities generally. Money raised through teas, dinners, and catering community events such as plowing matches supported these activities. At the provincial level, rural women agitated for better conditions for "working girls," the Canadianization of foreigners, support of the juvenile court (especially the appointment of female judges), film censorship, reformed dower laws, and suffrage. Funds from community projects supported the Social Service Council, the Red Cross, the Prohibition Alliance, the Children's Aid and other charitable organizations. Farm women were most active nationally during the war years. The Home Economics Societies and sister organizations worked in the home to conserve food and in the community to raise funds for patriotic purposes in aid of the war effort. Rural women thereby came together as social housekeepers, submerging other conflicting and overlapping identities in a common womanhood seeking a common community. As the 1923 president of the Manitoba Women's Institutes expressed it: "[i]n the world there are all classes of women; in our Women's Institutes there is only one. There is no dividing line. We meet together that we may grow as citizens into finer womanhood."[65]

The professional farm woman was the composite consumer, domestic producer, household manager/worker and community participant. Professionalism brought these individual, mundane components together, elevating their status. "How can a woman expect to be a proficient housekeeper or homemaker," Edith Charlton asked in 1907, "if she had no training along those lines which the profession includes?" The Home Economics program at MAC served to train women professionally, transforming farm girls into farm homemakers:

> Housekeeping has been given a place among the professions, and to fit young women of the Canadian west for the great work which devolves upon them in the development of the country, and to give them an intelligent working knowledge of those things which are vital in their work in the home ... [the course in Home Economics is offered].

Thus women's work — the most important in society in this view — was given a scientific and professional standing. Academic and semi-academic training encouraged women to think of themselves as professionals, allowing them to confidently and energetically assume their private and public roles. As an integral part of the ideal farm, the farm woman required a professional identity to complement her husband's professional status. "Farming," it was argued,

> is now recognized as a profession. Women are fast realizing that housekeeping, also, is a profession. Men find study necessary to feed stock properly or to prepare the soil for seed. Surely, then, women need to know how to feed their families properly or how to study and train their children.

The domestic equivalent of a "permanent, stable agriculture" was a "permanent, good home." Together, the progressive, professional farmer and the progressive, professional homemaker created a farm, a home and a community, which all fitted neatly into a larger, society-wide community.[66]

Children and Youth

The new rural educators did not make a fundamental distinction between girls and boys in the way they addressed children (as opposed to adolescents) in the schools, nor did they (for the most part) address farm children as specifically rural. Nature study, which had become a generic term for school gardening, elementary agriculture and agricultural education by the time the Dominion Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education was published in 1913, was a pedagogy applicable to all children. It was not designed to be technical instruction, but rather a means of giving children a practical orientation through interaction with the physical environment. This operated in two ways: children were treated as unique individuals and they were viewed as active social participants. In speaking generally of the new education in 1901, the principal of the Manitoba Normal School wrote:

> [E]ducation has been defined as the process whereby 'The individual is elevated to the species.' This implies that no individual should be free to follow, without restrictions, the leadings of his nature, but it does not necessarily imply that all pupils should be moulded after a single pattern.[67]

Education, that is to say, had to adapt to the peculiarities of individuals. Nature study was child centred in that it placed the individual child in a natural context, teaching the child its place in the natural domain and allowing the child to freely interact with nature within fairly broad parameters established by the teacher. According to Inspector A.S. Rose of Brandon, the best results in nature study were achieved when the teacher was incidental to instruction. He felt that the introduction of system destroyed student interest, transforming nature study into science.[68] This semi-autonomy also promoted practical activity. Through natural activities, a child's senses were disciplined and a bond of sympathy was established between the child and nature.[69] Especially after the introduction of the school garden program around 1907, children actually were able to work with other students learning the processes of food production, including the condition of seeds and plants, a knowledge of the soil, the destruction of weeds, and so forth.[70]

Beyond the narrow parameters of a specific item on the curriculum, nature study was also meant to be a method of teaching, informing all subjects by giving them a practical orientation. In 1913, for example, it was suggested that the whole curriculum could be revised to become more relevant to farm life and practical endeavour. Hence composition would involve writing descriptions of agrarian processes and letters related to farm business, history and geography would become the geography of local communities and the history of imports and exports, arithmetic would apply to farm problems, bookkeeping would deal with farm accounts, and the reading curriculum would include "How to" books for the farm.[71]

Adolescents, meanwhile, were addressed as future consumers, producers and social participants in rural communities. Through agricultural practice taught in the classroom, competition in school and club fairs, and participation in team

demonstrations, farm boys were formed as agricultural producers and farm managers oriented to market demand and profit maximization. To the extent farm women were producers, farm girls also studied agriculture and participated in the various production contests associated with school and club fairs. For the most part, however, they were trained for domestic work, specifically as household managers and market-wise consumers. Both boys and girls, in other words, learned the business skills relevant to their respective domains. For, as the MAC Boys' and Girls' Club Bulletin noted, "[b]usiness methods are being followed now by all successful farmers, and Boys' and Girls' Clubs afford the best possible place to begin the practice of business methods."[72] Furthermore, explained an American club pioneer, "club work trains the young people to become managers of their own business, and proprietors of farm land, animals, machinery, crops ... and helps them understand the supremacy of this position over that of being always a wage earner."[73] But demonstrations and clubs also created social service and leadership identities through which boys and girls could perform community functions. Working together on a project taught young people the values of community cooperation, while presenting their work in demonstrations and fairs trained them in skills such as public speaking. "The Boys' and Girls' Club," wrote Margaret Speechly (referring to farm girls), "gives her training which both attaches her to homemaking and makes her an efficient leader in the community... [ready to take] her part as a citizen, with power to use her influence in the affairs of the state."[74]

The team demonstration competitions of the early 1920s were particularly important in giving this training. In these events, community-organized club teams demonstrated the various components of a production process or a domestic activity in competition with teams from other communities. The form the competitions took created an identity of interest between young homemakers and farmers on the one hand, and the capitalist market on the other. The Junior Livestock Breeders Week in 1921, for example, brought farm boys to Winnipeg under the joint auspices of the local agricultural, educational and corporate institutions. Sponsored by the Canadian Bankers Association, United Grain Growers and the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, the itinerary included a visit to "some modern banking establishments" (the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the Merchant's Bank, and the Union Bank), a visit to Eaton's, an inspection of grain marketing methods at the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, "a motor trip through the business and residential districts and beauty spots of Winnipeg," a visit to the *Guide* and the United Grain Growers, a luncheon and tour of "a modern packing plant" (Swift's), and a visit to "a modern manufacturing company" (Vulcan Iron Works). Interspersed with these activities and the competitions were speeches from governmental authorities and other figures, notably Bracken from MAC (president), Thornton from the Ministry of Education (minister), Malcolm from the Ministry of Agriculture (minister), and E. Cora Hind from the *Free Press*.[75]

More interesting than this state/corporate sponsorship, however, was the language used in the demonstrations themselves. At the 1921 provincial girls' competition, for example, a team of three from Minnedosa demonstrated a food chopper. The demonstration began with one student discussing its manufacture:

> We have discovered that every manufacturing plant is a real university and we are glad to have an opportunity to get acquainted with one branch of this great industry. The great iron and steel industry comes second in providing human wants. Agriculture is, of course, first.

Patenting, blueprinting, and moulding were explained: "[m]ore than one piece of hardware can be made at once [with moulds] ... and this is the reason they sell things at a lower rate than if they made but one at a time." The demonstrator then displayed the various parts of the chopper, noting they "pass through the stage of manufacture and commerce, finally landing in the home or other places of industry." The second student discussed the retailing of the chopper, arguing there were two main factors involved: first, consumer interest, and second, the creation of desire for products, which involved showing the chopper to be labour-saving, time-saving or food-saving. She noted that every manufacturer had a catalogue listing their products for sale, which meant that "through mail and parcel post homes are supplied with household conveniences of hardware and farm tools which might not [otherwise] be possible since they could not be obtained at local stores." Finally, the third student discussed the home care and use of the chopper, suggesting that before "the days of the food chopper the housewife was compelled to use the chopping bowl and knife. It was wearisome, noisy and slow." But, she continued, "[n]otice how this food chopper prepares the food easily, quickly and in better condition for cooking."[76] In the minds of these young women, then, the homemaker and the manufacturing enterprise were integrally linked through the market.

From the 1890s and 1900s in Manitoba, but with increasing intensity after the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education report, the connection was drawn between the education of the young and the future of rural life. The first systematic linkage was made in commentary on the MAC Commission at the turn of the century. S.E. Lang, a school inspector, simply lamented in 1902 that the rural school "does not offer to the majority of country boys and girls getting into their teens a bill of fare sufficiently attractive under present economic conditions to secure their serious attention to it."[77] But H.S. Maclean, Assistant Principal of the Winnipeg Normal School in 1899, offered a more sophisticated analysis. To Maclean, the shift of population was an inevitable outcome of the application of science to industry and the consequent division of labour. The problem for rural society, and rural education in particular, lay with "the perverted sentiment" that identified farming solely with manual tasks in the division of labour. Although the "lure of the city" had an economic cause, it could be counterbalanced by challenging the false assumption about mental and manual labour in agriculture. Education, he argued, revealed that there was a great deal of scope for the exercise of mental labour in farming.[78] After 1910, and especially after 1913, articles and commentary were increasingly produced in which the problem of youth leaving the country for the city was posed, and the solution posited was to build a more positive image of the countryside. From discussions of school consolidation through agricultural short courses for teachers to the boosting of club work, farm life was simultaneously portrayed as being worthy of the young and in need of improvement to keep the young. "Club work," Margaret Speechly suggested in 1919, "demonstrates how to make farming and homemaking a practical business and give the rural young people an argument to help them refuse positions in the city."[79]

More specifically, the *raison d'être* of the rural school system was defined by the rural problem. At one level, the problem provided the general context in which teachers were trained. The Brandon Normal School, opened in 1912, was explicitly described within its terms:

> There are two large classrooms, library, manual training rooms, gymnasium, etc., and the school is expected to give special attention to the rural school problem. Its geographical location, its ample grounds, and the equipment generally, will aid greatly in dealing with that problem.[80]

At another level, the purpose of the rural school curriculum, especially after the appointment of a Director of Elementary Agriculture and Nature, was to facilitate "the great movement for the improvement of country homes and country life." Indeed, educators such as Robert Fletcher went so far as to suggest that schools should take the lead in improving agriculture and rural communities through the complete appropriation of the educative function. He wrote:

> If agriculture is to be improved, the community must take agricultural education in hand. It has too long been left to the home to provide that instruction. But the method and outlook of home instruction in agriculture is traditional, non-scientific and non-progressive.[81]

While it may have been too ambitious for educators to think they could gain such complete control over the young, it was generally accepted among proponents and supporters of rural education that the schools could be used to reach into the farms and homes to educate and transform the practice of adults. One commentator noted in 1912 that "one great advantage of the public school is that the pupils are able to be home every night and so apply the new knowledge that they acquire daily."[82] It was the fairs and clubs, however, that performed this task most effectively. Boys and girls carried on their projects at the home farm, under the distant but effective direction of a teacher or extension worker. This expertise, although mediated through the student, did reach the farm woman or man. In fact, agrarian intellectuals considered this mediated education, and its social effects, to be among the main purposes of club work. Of eight "objects and aims of club work" enumerated in 1918, the first three were:

> 1. To bring home and school closer together in understanding, sympathy, and co-operative efforts.
> 2. To make the school the centre for the acquisition and dissemination of information of direct practical value to the community and to make the home and the home farm, with its implements, its livestock, its fields and farm buildings, the laboratory where all this knowledge will be applied under actual farming conditions.
> 3. To arouse a spirit of loyalty to the school, the community, and the Province by a more complete realization and appreciation of the assistance which members may be able to render each other.[83]

Finally, the young and the school system were used to conceptualize and build rural communities. Club work was described as being useful in bridging the gap between local businessmen and farmers, and town women and farm women. Bankers in particular, it was said, gained a better understanding of the farm economy through their participation in the clubs.[84] But it was the school consolidation movement that was particularly important in community formation. Proponents of school consolidation viewed the demise of rural schools and the rise of centralized (in towns and villages) consolidated schools as an important contribution to community identity. Country children could enjoy all the advantages of a "city school" under consolidation, and escape the "lure of the city." Moreover, the consolidated school could become a genuine community centre, providing an institutional focus for the community. It could draw the isolated farm family under

its influence, and overcome the parochialism and divisiveness of country life.[85] The Wingham Consolidated School, as described by Margaret Speechly in 1922, for example, was central to the development of a "new community era" in the Wingham district near Elm Creek. Prior to the construction of the school, many of the younger adults were planning to move to the city for the winter because of a lack of social activity, and older people were also suffering from the absence of a community centre. But with the new consolidated school, teaching was available for young and old:

> [A]fter school hours the plant is used by the older members of the community. On Sunday everybody turns out to attend church in the auditorium, with Sunday School following the service — in fact, even a wedding was held there recently. The UFWM, the Community Club, the School Board, the Young People's Association and other organizations have their regular meetings in the basement of the school, which seats 250 people. Dances, debates, concerts and such events are well attended for everyone in the district feels right at home in a place which belongs to the whole community.

"Why," Speechly asked rhetorically, "do we hear so much about the cityward drift, the lack of rural leaders, the drabness of country life? Because in many cases the people in rural districts have not had the vision of the Wingham Idea or the means to put it into practice."[86]

Ideal male and female identities were created for young people, then, that were designed to prepare them for farming and homemaking. But young people, and the institutions created for them, had a special place in this ideology since it was believed that the identities of all rural people could be moulded through the young.

Intellectuals

The agricultural and home economics intellectuals who staffed the agricultural college as lecturers and the extension service as extension workers were central participants in the creation of these various identities. The ostensible purpose of their work was to transmit agricultural and domestic knowledge to rural people and to contribute to a better rural life. Their role and influence were not that simple, however; or, rather, the process of conveying knowledge was not that simple. Nor was it one-sided.

Agrarian intellectual practice was transformed in Manitoba between the 1890s and the 1920s as amateur endeavour gave way to professionalism. The characteristic public method of knowledge transmission for men in the 1890s was the institute meeting and the institute lecture. Although the Central Institute provided local institutes with specialized experts to the extent that they were available, more often than not institute members themselves presented papers on specific topics. If someone did speak from outside the local institute, he might simply be a "successful farmer" from another area of the province. Hence the distinction between expert and farmer was not clearly or closely drawn in the institute approach.[87] Female knowledge, meanwhile, was not publicly organized through state institutions until the 1910s. The public discourse that did exist in the earlier period, beyond informal socializing at the farm and district level, took place in the women's section of farm and rural newspapers, notably *The Farmers' Advocate*. Through this medium, farm women carried on a fairly egalitarian discussion, via

correspondence, which was merely facilitated by the women's editor. As in the case with men in the institutes, then, there was no sense of a socially distinct expert. The "experts" in this world were simply the older, more experienced women.

But by the late 1890s there was pressure mounting from within the institutes, the agricultural press and other sources for a more rigorous approach to agricultural and domestic education. As that approach took form in MAC and the extension service, agrarian intellectuals emerged as a new and distinct social group in Manitoba.[88] MAC served both as a site where intellectuals were employed and as a place where they were trained. The agriculture and home economics degree programs, and the limited graduate instruction that existed by the 1920s, provided that training, and served to distinguish the "professional agriculturalist" and "professional home economist" from the "professional farmer" and "professional homemaker." Whereas the diploma graduate returned to the farm as a farmer or homemaker, the degree graduate was normally destined for agro-industry, government, education or journalism as an agriculturalist or home economist. This educational division opened up a social distinction between the specialist (intellectual) and the generalist (practitioner). The extension service was based on this distinction. In contrast to the institute approach, for example, the extension approach provided expert literature, expert speakers, and local competitions and programs under expert direction. Any local initiative was controlled through short courses or teacher training programs in which local intellectuals were trained. And eventually, with the district representative and home representative program, it was possible to place properly trained intellectuals in communities to give on-the-spot "shop floor" guidance.[89] This social distinction was accompanied by a distinct identity. Through participation in the MAC Research Association or the Manitoba Home Economics Association, and later in truly professional organizations such as the American Home Economics Association, the Canadian Society of Technical Agriculturalists, or the American Farm Management Association, Manitoba agrarian intellectuals asserted a sense of themselves as professionals with a respectable standing in a wider scientific and professional community.[90]

There was a subtle yet persistent change during the period in the area of who an expert was, what it meant to be an expert, and how one became an expert. In the farmers' institutes and agricultural societies that characterized the world of agricultural knowledge before 1905, the farmer was the expert. To have expertise was to be a successful farmer, and the successful farmer communicated his knowledge to other farmers by presenting papers at institute meetings, participating in agricultural society fairs, or competing in such things as plowing matches. In turn, one became an expert by attending such events and learning from other farmers.[91] Moreover, the domain of legitimate knowledge was reasonably broad and fluid. Although partisan political debate was forbidden in the institutes, issues in political economy that were of special concern to farmers, such as the tariff, were discussed.[92] For farm women prior to 1905, the category of expert was virtually nonexistent. In "Minnie May's" department in *The Farmers' Advocate*, for example, all women were invited to share their experiences, solicit information and offer advice. While Minnie May did convey opinion, it was directed towards older girls and younger women as if emanating from an older, more seasoned aunt. Addressing her constituency as "My dear nieces," she would clarify received wisdom (the contours of separate spheres, for example) or

defend the "new womanhood" against traditional patriarchal assault. Much of her allotted space, however, was given over to general discussion by correspondents. Hence expertise resided with those who had experiences to share, and one gained expertise through sharing experiences.[93]

By the 1920s this had changed substantially. The image of the practitioner-as-expert had been transformed through its subordination to the image of the intellectual-as-expert. The real experts were now the professional agriculturalists and home economists who guided and trained others in the acquisition of expertise. For the intellectuals, expertise meant being scientifically trained in a specialty and conducting work in a neutral and apolitical environment. Pure knowledge was pursued through extensive training and detailed research projects, the results of which were then dispensed to farmers and homemakers.[94] This was an expertise the latter two groups could not acquire practically. It was only available through the services of an intellectual.

Intellectuals were legitimized in their social role through an ideology in which the composite intellectual, symbolizing a combination of specialties, became the model for the idealized farmer and homemaker. The composite agricultural intellectual, driven by an ethic of service, had the requisite knowledge of scientific agriculture and its practical application, an entrepreneur's understanding of the market and the pursuit of profit, and a sophisticated sense of the rural problem and its resolution. The composite home economics intellectual, meanwhile, was fully conversant with efficient housekeeping methods, the place of the consuming household in the economy, and the duties of social and community homemaking. The ultimate personifications of these abstractions were the district representatives and home demonstration agents. Actually, in communities working with farmers and homemakers on an ongoing basis, they transmitted information as equals, and were eventually accepted on these terms.[95] "This man on the spot," wrote the Ontario Deputy Minister of Agriculture in 1911 (referring to the district representative), "brings into his county all those resources of the government departmental organisation about which the farmer had some hazy knowledge but whose usefulness he had questioned, and 'professors' and 'experts' become real men like themselves whose object is not to pose as men of exclusive distinction and drawers of salaries, but men able and willing to give help."[96] District representatives, home economists and their professional agriculturalist colleagues symbolized what the farmer and homemaker should and could become, and won their confidence by working closely with them. The difference, of course, was that intellectuals were not in the same social position as farm women and men; they were not market actors nor active agents in producing households, but state employees.

The texts considered in this chapter, the broader discourse in which they operated, and the intellectuals who were their media addressed farm people as individual and collective subjects participating in market-oriented agriculture and stable rural communities. It was reasonable to expect that farm people, occupying a contradictory position in capitalist society, would identify with these images since the images were at least a partial reflection of people's everyday work experiences. Farm men were producers, and farm women were household workers and managers, participating in a market economy. They were all members of rural communities. As has been suggested throughout this chapter, however, these were ideal visions. There was also a competing vision at work which

attempted to comprehend and explain the reality of farming in different terms. This alternative offered a challenge to the discursive unity of the dominant system, appropriating and transforming some of its elements while refusing to be limited by its boundaries. But, failing to generate its own theoretical categories, it ultimately succumbed, leaving a populist residue. The rise and fall of this challenge is the subject of chapter six.

SIX

The Language of Agrarianism

During the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century, the language of the Manitoba agrarian movement was characterized by a discursive tension between the dominant ideology outlined in the previous two chapters and popular ideologies that challenged the official conceptions. The radicalism of the Patrons of Industry (Patronism) imparted a significant oppositional tone to the language of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association (MGGA) and the United Farmers of Manitoba (UFM). The "main" (men's) movement continued to employ something of a class analysis that it inherited from the nineteenth century, while the Women's Section, after its formation in 1918, combined this inheritance with a mild form of gender analysis which had been filtered through middle-class feminism. By the time of the farm movement's reentry into electoral politics in the 1920s, however, popular language was effectively constrained by the dominant ideology. This chapter traces the contours and usage of this popular language, and its subordination to dominant social and economic discourse, between 1890 and 1925.[1]

Oppositional Radicalism

Although a Grange local was founded at High Bluff in the 1870s, significant agrarian insurgency in Manitoba really dates from the early 1880s. The fall of 1883 witnessed the formation of two organizations, one in Manitou and the other in Brandon, dedicated to agrarian reform. The western group, the Manitoba and Northwest Farmers' Union, adopted a platform calling for tariff modifications, Manitoba's right to charter railways, the settlement of public lands, lower freight rates and an end to elevator monopoly. The southern organization, the Manitoba and Northwest Farmers' Protective Union, meanwhile, sought the general repeal of laws that favoured monopolists and oppressed farmers.[2] The Protective Union was a more purely farmers' organization than the Farmers' Union because the latter included grain dealers within its ranks. Although both movements failed within three years, they left a legacy of political agitation and a system of cooperative enterprises, notably a number of farmer-owned elevators around the province, upon which future activists could build.[3]

After a period in the later 1880s during which the Liberal Party dominated agrarian discontent, the decade of the 1890s opened with the formation of the Rockwood Farmers' Alliance, the organization of the Farmers' League of Manitoba at Cartwright, and the establishment of new farmer-owned elevator companies at Carman, Carberry, Neepawa, Crystal City and Morden.[4] In retrospect, these activities simply presaged the emergence of the Patrons of Industry in the winter of 1891-92. An immediate outgrowth of the Ontario Patrons, formed in 1889, this latest expression of insurgency was, like the Grange, the Farmers' Alliance and the Farmers' League before it, part of a broader North American movement. The first

Manitoba locals were, in fact, initiated by an American organizer. Subassociations then grew quickly throughout the settled areas of Manitoba and into the North-West during 1892. Constituted as fraternal brotherhoods, with the accompanying paraphernalia and ritual, the Patrons were also heavily engaged in various aspects of cooperative buying and selling throughout their existence. By 1894, however, their primary energies were shifting in the direction of electoral politics.[5]

The first element in Patronism was a labour theory of value in which farmers and workers shared common interests as the creators of wealth. In a letter to *The Patrons' Advocate* in 1895, "Pro Patria" wrote that "the greatest misfortune of a country is poor farmers." The author then elaborated in terms of a labour theory of worth:

> Every man should be secured in his labor and in his homestead; he should work for himself and not for others, no one should share in the profits who does not share in the production. Labor must have the exclusive right to the produce, if we are ever to achieve permanency and stability in agriculture. ... Laws must be passed to secure the exclusive right of the occupier of the ground to the fruits of his labor.[6]

Besides succinctly stating this radical conception of wealth as it applied to agriculture, this statement is significant for its use of the phrase "permanency and stability in agriculture." As was noted in the previous chapter, permanency and stability were integral components of the ideology of market agriculture. But here permanency and stability would be achieved only by removing the "tyranny of capitalists."

The passage is also noteworthy for its use of the term "labor," although the specific focus is agriculture. An exclusively agrarian theory of value was sometimes employed in Patronism, but this "physiocratic" sentiment was rare.[7] "Without wasting space by needless demonstration, let us assume that society rests upon the labor of farmers," wrote Henry Clay in an editorial plea for Patron cooperation with "Labor Unions" and "Trade Organizations." On the fundamental basis of food production, he argued, carpenters and masons provide shelter, tailors provide clothing, the merchant comes into existence, and factories and mills arise to supply the merchant. But, "[t]he whole procession is headed by the farmer."[8] More commonly, no distinction was drawn between the labour of farmers and workers. For example, Spender Percival of Glenora, an occasional contributer to the *Advocate*, referred to "the farmer and working classes — the producers as the source of wealth to the country" in an 1895 letter.[9] Clay, meanwhile, in a late 1894 article entitled "Indirect Taxation and Agriculture," used the term "laborers," and then added the following clarification: "when I say laborers, I include the farmer, for whilst in theory he is a capitalist, in practice he is a laborer and producer, and is largely dependent on capital in our complex society."[10] A radical producerism is paramount here, but the apparent tension between the dominant agrarian identity (farmer as capitalist) and the radical inheritance (farmer as worker) reflects the emergence of a pattern which became increasingly evident after the turn of the century.

It followed, of course, that farmers should learn from the experiences of workers. Trade union organization was viewed as a useful model for agrarian mobilization in the Patron analysis. Employing the radical terms of political power and privilege, the *Advocate* drew attention to the ways in which workers banded

together in unions to counteract the overpowering influence "wealth exerts when used by unscrupulous hands." Trade unions improved social conditions for their members and, more importantly, challenged "the right of the political and moneyed classes to frame laws by which Labor has only to contribute and the Capitalist but to enjoy." The Patrons of Industry, it was concluded, could be to farmers what unions were to the wage earner.[11] In more forceful language, Henry Clay wrote on the first day of 1896 that farmers, in comparison to workers, were complacent. Whereas workers had revolted in strikes and riots, gaining concessions from "monopolists," farmers had patiently endured the smallest rewards. "Had we united — refused to produce as workmen strike — would the railroad companies," he asked rhetorically, "contemptuously disdain our petitions for redress? Would wheat buying syndicates squeeze us?" Workers, facing the loss of their homes and their means of subsistence, persevered and conquered. But farmers, often in a better position than workers to resist because they had food enough to survive and homes free of rent, patiently suffered. The lesson, if it needed to be stated, was that "[w]e must connect the farming community into a powerful organization with which we can confront our oppressive monopolists, and make each farmer feel a brotherly interest in his neighbors welfare."[12]

Furthermore, the necessity and desirability of worker-farmer cooperation was stressed in this analysis. In an *Advocate* piece entitled "Massing for Attack," for example, the Patron policy of excluding nonfarmers from the organization was criticized by Clay. It was becoming clear, he argued, that the Patrons should include in their fold "every honest man who earns his bread by labor." Hence, with a view to ultimately joining with labour, all Patron subassociations were urged to discuss the question of cooperation with trade unions.[13] Moreover, the leadership of the movement addressed a constituency that extended beyond the farm and the countryside. At the 1895 convention in Brandon, Grand President Braithwaite focussed on the public debt and the tariff as means of discussing the problems producers were facing. "Think of these things," he urged in his speech to delegates, "analyze them for yourselves and see if it is not the time we farmers and laborers cast aside our old prejudices, and without bias, fear or favor take a common sense view of the situation." It was time, he continued, "to lift our craft and calling out of debt, indifference and apparent serfdom."[14] Patronism, as a form of antimonopoly radicalism, in fact *demanded* the mobilization of all wealth producers. But there were organizational and ecological impediments that had to be overcome: there was little or no daily interaction between farmers and workers, and farmers found it difficult to sustain the sort of solidarity which, for workers, grew out of shared work experiences. Although the will existed at one level, a successful alliance required a high degree of organization. At another level, however, the will did not exist: a focus on politics as the source of oppression could not sustain the required mobilization around economic and social issues.

But who were the oppressors in this analysis? Outside the producers, and pitted against them, stood the monopolists, combinesters and parasites who manipulated politics and the state in order to rob the producers and enrich themselves. The most significant actors here were the railway corporations, mortgage companies, financiers and manufacturers, but the analysis also included lawyers and other professionals, especially in their roles as politicians and "party wire-pullers." In one particularly vivid rendition of this perspective, an *Advocate* correspondent appealed for potential members to join the Patrons:

> FELLOW WORKERS: ... Canada does not belong to the people of Canada who by their labour and toil produce its wealth. No! Canada does not even belong to the British Crown, but to a handful of financiers, capitalists and bondholders in England and some other countries who have for their agents ... a gang of titled and decorated snobs and boodlers to whom the people of Canada have unfortunately too long entrusted their affairs.

He went on to charge that every year the tariff and other forms of taxation took millions out of the unpaid labour of workers and "the depreciated produce of the toilers of the soil. ... Look at the unemployed in cities and towns, the laborer without work, the farmer toiling without hope, and all the time the salaries and incomes of the drones and parasites who live at our expense remain the same."[15] While weaving elements of an older with a newer analysis (the image of aristocratic privilege alongside a working class salutation), this passage touched a number of the bases in Patronism.

In this analysis, the oppressors constituted a discrete social group who were defined negatively as those who did not produce. In some cases, a distinction was drawn between the "classes" and the "masses." For Spender Percival, the masses had been divided between two political parties, while the classes — "Capitalists, Manufacturers, Combinesters, Directors of Railroads, Loan Companies, and Lawyers" — were united in sucking the people dry.[16] In other Patron statements, a dominant and a subordinate class were identified. "Are mortgages and [the] CPR," asked an *Advocate* correspondent in 1894,

> oppressive to this great Western country, and to the liberty and fraternal bonds cementing Confederation? Are they not the mouldering branches that prevent us from making our little ones as comfortable as Sir John Thompson? Why all the injustice and social inequality between the two classes of society, millionare [*sic*] and pauper...?

He appealed to Patrons to "combine against the misrule that has given the country the pile of mortgages and its pile of millionaires," and he invoked a distant radical heritage in conclusion by demanding "social revolution [to] give us back the liberty of free men."[17] For Manitoba and North-Western farmers, according to this analysis, class exploitation felt particularly acute given the conditions under which they arrived in the West. One Patrons of Industry subassociation, in passing a resolution urging the government to take action against the "grain combine," produced a settler's image of class relations:

> this Association views with alarm the action of the grain combine in this country, and we call upon all farmers, especially Patrons, to rise en masse and press upon our governments the urgent necessity of freeing us once and forever from these manipulators of our prosperity in this Western land. The Dominion government brought us here and gave us free homes. Now they allow railroads and combines to rob us (by law) of the products of our industry obtained from our land which makes the gift worse than nothing.[18]

The "manipulators of prosperity" achieved and maintained their dominance through political "chicanery" in this ideology. Lawyers and politicians, serving the combinesters and monopolists, both created and manipulated laws in order to rob the producers. Everything from the tariff, freight rates and government expenditure to wheat grades, royal commissions and even agricultural education was understood in these terms. The denunciation of this political immorality is what ultimately defined Patronism.

Government expenditure, taxation and the tariff were manifestations of the legalized robbery facing producers. The "oppressor" rather than the "oppressed," it was said, should be taxed. Corporations received millions of dollars worth of land grants and timber limits for which producers ultimately paid.[19] Public debt was the result of the wealthy enriching themselves at the expense of the people. The 1895 Dominion deficit, for example, projected to be five million dollars, was denounced at a Killarney Patrons meeting as an unjust burden foisted upon labourers and farmers. "Where did the money go?" Brother Hossack asked rhetorically in addressing the assembled crowd:

> spent on harbor works and Curran bridges, and thrown broadcast amongst wire-pullers and party heelers. ... Now has patience ceased to be a virtue, let us rise up as one man against such red tapeism and be not deceived by their sweet speeches while they sit at banquets, laughing and mocking the clodhoppers and hayseeds.[20]

The burden could only be reduced by eliminating public expenditure on those items that benefitted the wealthy. One Patron MLA recommended, therefore, that monies be diverted from the lieutenant governor's office to clothe people who could not afford proper clothing and from the University of Manitoba to be used to support common schools.[21] Another Patron, in the context of a call to shift the tariff burden from necessities to luxuries, made a similar proposal. The reduced revenue from a reformed tariff could be offset, he said, by abolishing the Senate, lieutenant governorships, high commissionerships and pensions. Then additional revenue, for more worthwhile endeavours to aid farmers and workers, could be raised by taxing concentrated capital.[22]

The tariff, the major source of public revenue in nineteenth-century Canada, was frequently the focus of producer wrath. Indeed, to many it was the penultimate symbol of plutocracy. A composite image existed in Patronism (and other radical analyses) of the parasitic class, protected behind a legal barrier, growing rich through the labour of others. In a survey of the situation in which farmers were forced to exist in the 1890s, for example, John Fotheringham of Grenfell, Assiniboia wrote:

> They found themselves toiling with little results in comfort — small returns and heavy outlay for the necessaries of life and labor. Merchants, lawyers and others, especially manufacturers, were serving themselves unmercifully out of their toils. Such classes had come into the possession of legal advantages by which they could line their pockets out of yours. ... Good men labor and labor and can scarcely make any preparation for sickness or old age. Why should this be so in a good land like ours? It comes largely or mainly through political causes. Favored industries and parties are protected and become wealthy at our expense, and use their wealth in maintaining and supporting this unhappy situation.[23]

And for some, the fight against the tariff was nothing less than the historic struggle of free-born Englishmen:

> From Runnymede to the time the Stuart lost his head and the family the dynasty, the Anglo Saxon has been struggling to be free, from the time of the Tudors to the present the struggle has gone on, and we are more in earnest than ever. Free trade is the cure for a great many of the evils from which we suffer.[24]

In protesting the inequities of the tariff, then, farmers were not simply or calculatingly seeking fairer access to markets; rather, they were seeking the elimination of their oppressor.

Political manipulation extended throughout the state apparatus in the Patron view. According to Henry Clay, the statutory regulation of wheat grades was foisted on the farmers in the interests of middlemen. In the 1890s, the act specified that Number 1 Manitoba hard wheat should be at least 60 lb./bu. and 2/3 Red Fyfe. But the act also constituted a "board of standards" to fix a yearly standard which could vary upward from the minimum. Hence, in 1895-96, the standard for Number 1 hard was 63 lb./bu. and 75 percent Red Fyfe. "All through the paragraphs of this crazy law," Clay wrote, "we find the same variation, the Act states so much, the standard so much more. There are many kinds of harm this foolish arrangement causes." Specifically, he maintained, the speculator was permitted to ship from Fort William on the act and not the standard, thereby robbing the producer of the difference. "In no other country that the *Advocate* is acquainted with," the editorial concluded, "would such official assistance to rascality be even attempted."[25]

A more explicitly ideological forum for the operation of "rascality" was the public investigatory body. In reporting a rumour in 1894 that a royal commission might be appointed to enquire into the problem of CPR freight rates, Clay urged farmers to mobilize and be on their guard against the deceit of the rich and powerful:

> The task of fighting the mighty company is an enormous one. Every big city in the East ... will array themselves against us. The examiners will be met with chicane — with humbug — with threats and open lies by the legal rascaldom that lays itself out for hire on such occasion. ... [T]he whole brigade of managers and grain mixers will be ready to testify to anything that Van Horne may desire. Our examiners will have to wring reluctant evidence from the creatures of that powerful company by every means in their power, and as their means are not very extensive in the confused present state of the law, they must have an overpowering — overwhelming — flood of angry public opinion behind them to back them up.[26]

The state, in this instance, was seen as being potentially neutral, assuming a high degree of popular pressure could be maintained upon the government.

Political manipulation even extended to school texts in this analysis. One *Advocate* reader, in submitting a poem in reaction to a letter from a farmer who was being hounded off his land by a mortgage company, anticipated that agricultural education in a corrupted state would be ideologically skewed against a producerist perspective. Prefacing his rewritten mortgage deed by suggesting it "should be put in our proposed agricultural school books to teach the boys how to rent a farm," he wrote:

> Whereas cute lawyers always use Whereas at each line end,
> The Lord has failed the last few years enough good wheat to send
> Wherewith to square your nine percent, Your farm is pawned my friend.
> Beyond redeem, so pray give heed and close to me attend.
>
> You'll promise, won't you honor bright to live on straw, no chaff,
> And like a stupid donkey toil, And nothing do by half.
> Don't murmur though your children starve, Your wife should need a shroud
> Don't let your chicken heart rebel, Poor men should ne'er be proud.
>
> Whereas you'll promise won't you now next year to pay three rents
> Though it be far from human ken, To know our God's intents
> And be prepared within a week to quit your hearth and home
> And oe'r the storm swept prairie in search of shelter roam.

Don't talk of rights, your [*sic*] but a serf, A fool, a lazy hog
Go to your kennel or I'll kick As if you were a dog
Yet hold, should you to death succumb, Just will your son and heir
To send the money from the farm As though you still were there.[27]

No area of the state, then, from the tariff to textbooks, was free from the pervasive influence of oppressive manipulation.

It is hardly surprising, given this analysis, that political organizing was central to Patronism. Political oppression, after all, required a political response. The politics of Patronism was based upon the assumption that not only the state, but inherited political practice as well, was corrupted by the influence of capitalists, lawyers and various other undesirables. Producers, notably farmers, had to create a new politics to take control of their own and the country's affairs. The key to this was nonpartisanship. From a twentieth-century perspective — specifically the experience of Brackenism — nonpartisanship has a businesslike, apolitical meaning.[28] But the Patrons, as they proclaimed in their rallying cry, were "nonpartisan, but intensely political."[29] To them, nonpartisanship meant rejecting parties which were merely media through which nonproducers milked producers. "Extreme partizanship," according to the *Patrons' Sentinel*,

> robs the poor. Extreme partizanship is a means for the rich to become wealthy. Extreme partizanship causes the strife and struggle amongst the few for supremacy and causes deadlock and chaos in the House of Commons at the present time and the people foot the bill.[30]

Or, as expressed in the Declaration of the Independent Industrial Association, which succeeded the Patrons in 1898:

> Realizing ... that the partisan spirit predominating has resulted in enabling combines, trusts and other monopolies to procure legislation and privileges to the detriment of the great mass of the people ... we, the Associated Independents of Manitoba, deem it necessary that all men of free spirit should unite, to arouse and inform public opinion, to terminate the practice of government by party dictators, to frustrate the ominous designs of predatory corporations, to free the community from present exactions which rob the people of the fruits of their labor, and, generally, to take such independent political action as the public advantage may indicate.[31]

The Patrons wanted to transform legislative and parliamentary representation by replacing the lawyers and other professionals with farmer and worker delegates. Since the Liberal Party appropriated much of the radical rhetoric while remaining under the control of nonproducers, it was the object of most Patron wrath. The secretary of the Boissevain Patrons Association suggested, for example, that Liberal policy directives came from above, while in the Patrons they came from below. If the Patrons were like the Liberals, he maintained, the following is the type of circular the Grand Association would send to the subassociations:

> Dear Brethren — We consider it our duty to inform you that we have been laboring under a mistake in believing that the Protective Policy has worked to our disadvantage, that it is only right and just that the CPR should charge such freight rates as will enable them to declare a satisfactory dividend to the shareholders, and that owing to the superior knowledge and understanding of the learned professions they are best qualified to act as parliamentary representatives. This is our conclusion and we hope you will govern yourselves accordingly. We are sorry you have been misled in the past, and advise you to seek for future relief, only in diversified farming and the practice of economy in the home.

In the Patrons of Industry such arrogance would cause uproar because Patrons were attached to principle rather than party.[32]

The various aspects of Patron political practice were conducted within the terms of nonpartisanship and a broader radical discourse. Patron election platforms were cast within the assumptions of the radical inheritance, even though they appear to be moderate, reformist documents from the perspective of the later twentieth century. The Dominion platform demanded that public lands be reserved and preserved for actual settlers, that the tariff exists only to raise revenue, and that legislation be passed to protect farmers and labourers from the undue price increases of monopolies and combines. Furthermore, it sought rigid economy in the public service, simplification of laws, the abolition of the Senate, the disfranchisement of the civil service and a general reduction in the machinery of government. The provincial program repeated the call for economy in the public service, while also demanding the "purity and independence of Parliament" which meant, in practice, that no MLA should receive a free railroad pass or a fee beyond his sessional indemnity. Formulated as it was in the 1890s, the local platform also had to address the issue of public schools. On this question, Patrons stood "unalterably opposed to any appropriation of public monies for sectarian purposes." Hence, their position was little different from that of the Liberals, and a significant factor in their demise. For Patrons, however, the provision of public funds for religious schools was a species of special privilege fundamentally at odds with their vision of an uncorrupted state.[33]

The Independent Industrial Association included most of the Patron demands in its platform. They were supplemented, however, by calls for the public ownership of railroads and other "natural monopolies," reflecting the influence of both labourite "socialism" and new school economics.[34] Patronism was, in fact, quite friendly to the socialism it encountered in the Manitoba of the 1890s. In answering the objections many people had to socialism, however, the *Advocate* simply applied the categories of radicalism, interpreting socialism within its terms:

> Socialism, pure and simple, means equality before the law. ... Socialism does not propose to divide existing wealth, but assume control of all monopolies and sources of wealth and utilize them to put it beyond the power of any man to become a millionare [*sic*], and insists every citizen will have equal rights with other citizens.[35]

The *Advocate* response to the specifics of the Labour Party platform, meanwhile, was rather skeptical, although all the objectives were viewed as being desirable. But those proposals that involved relations between capital and labour, unmediated by the state, were seen as being difficult to attain. For example, the Labour Party sought "equal remuneration for equal services rendered, irrespective of sex." The *Advocate*, though supportive in principle, felt the proposal did not belong in a "political" program.[36]

The electoral element in Patron political practice was sustained, to a certain extent, by a utopian undercurrent, which suggests that it had more substance than twentieth-century reformism and a solid connection with earlier utopian variants of radicalism, notably Owenism. The Harmony Industrial Association formed in Assiniboia in the mid-1890s, was a utopian experiment based upon radical premises. The vice president of the Association, writing in the *Advocate* in 1895, told Patrons that he and his comrades were laying the foundation of a new social system.

"Now the economic development of the present system [competition] produces co-operation," W.C. Paynter argued, "which is compelled by monopoly, [which ultimately results in] government ownership of monopolies. This in turn leads to the 'co-operative commonwealth'." The Harmony settlement was modelled on combines, but unlike monopolies and combines where "all the profits accrue to the shareholders, and none to the men who actually are the producers," the means of production were held in common, each farmer was an employee of the Association, and annual income was divided according to labour performed.[37]

A more specifically Patronist vision of utopia was contained in the fictional story "Home Rule in Manitoba," which appeared in the *Advocate* in 1895. Presented as an 1899 recollection of the insurrection that established "home rule," the narrative began at an auction in Melita. Farmers interrupted the auction, burning machinery and implements so that capitalists could not reclaim them. They then proceeded to Winnipeg, arrested the police, mayor and aldermen, cut the electricity, took over communications, and issued a declaration:

> To the Citizens of Manitoba: Most of us have found it impossible to make the barest of living in Manitoba. This is not the fault of the country, but of the laws, the railway freight rates, and the protective tariff. ... Let us manage things in future that we get some return for our money and our labor.

Residents of the city were then asked to send delegates to a convention. This assembly of rural folks and urbanites decided to cease sending parliamentary representatives to Ottawa and to no longer receive the federal subsidy nor pay the tariff. Free trade was declared with the rest of the world. After reaching these decisions and others, the assembled producers dispersed to sack the Customs House, the Land Titles Office, and lawyers' offices. Then, upon hearing that the North West Mounted Police were moving in from Regina, the rails were torn up at Oak Lake.[38] Although the story ends there, one presumes the associated producers of Manitoba, freed from plutocratic oppression, lived happily ever after.

Patrons created an image of themselves, their constituency and their social world based upon a set of assumptions that had existed as a more or less coherent discourse, in one form or other, throughout the nineteenth century. The image was one of producers creating all wealth in the context of a political system in which they were controlled, oppressed and robbed by nonproducers. The Patron response to this political manipulation was a theory of nonpartisanship in which traditional politics, rejected as inherently corrupt, would be replaced by a new morality based upon class rather than party loyalty. With the collapse of the Patrons, this form of analysis began to fade as a unified system of thought. Not only were its categories being stretched to the limit in an attempt to comprehend new economic and social realities, but it was being challenged, in a systematic though indirect way, by the new academic disciplines. It did not die, however. Many of the categories, and the concepts which linked them together, lived on into the twentieth century, giving oppositional substance and form to critiques developed in the twentieth-century farm movement.

Conservative Agrarianism

The turn of the century did not mark a sudden shift from radicalism to a less oppositional analysis. But by the 1920s there was a new, and more conservative,

discursive system at the heart of Manitoba agrarianism. In the period from 1904 to roughly 1916, a more or less coherent radical analysis continued to exist in the mainstream of the movement. From about 1910 onwards, however, dominant categories began to displace radical categories and, by the postwar period, the mainstream discourse of Manitoba agrarianism was subordinate to the dominant rural ideology. This section first looks at this new conservative agrarianism that became systematized, from about 1916 to 1925; it then traces some of the radical language that did survive in the history of the movement, from about 1903 to 1925.

The economic discussion that characterized conservative agrarianism was conducted squarely within the context of market production and consumption. Most importantly, cooperative marketing and purchasing, which were central to the grain-grower vision of agriculture, were understood simply as strategic interventions in a neutral market in which middlemen, interspersed between producer and consumer, had developed an unfair advantage. The capitalist market was the given terrain upon which cooperation worked. The appeal of cooperation was that it reduced inefficiencies while claiming a larger proportion of the surplus (profit) for agricultural producers. "One of our biggest problems at the present time," President Burnell told the 1924 UFM convention,

> is to bring the price of those commodities which we have to buy and which have to do with our cost of production, down to the level of the products of our farms. One factor in the price of these commodities is the costly system of distribution — this can be remedied by co-operation.

Furthermore, it was noted the following year, cooperation would return "to the producer all the profits accrued over the cost of the operations in marketing his product."[39] Besides these immediate commercial objectives, farmers learned from the MGGA's *Rural Citizenship* that cooperative organization also drew isolated farmers together in a community of interest, restored agriculture to its proper place of dignity "which has been lost through bad business methods," and replaced bad business methods with good ones. And at a higher level, Hopkins Moorhouse argued in *Deep Furrows*, the various actors in agriculture (such as farmers, merchants and railways) could cooperate to create a truly efficient economy.[40] Ultimately, the Wheat Pool was the archetypal cooperative marketing organization in conservative agrarianism. It was voluntarist, based upon the individual wills and decisions of producers (as opposed to the compulsory "state socialist" Wheat Board). It was completely equitable, basing its price offered for grain on "real" values in the world market. Finally, it operated on the basis of managerial expertise, hiring the best and most market-wise grain trade managers available. In other words, the Pool combined an efficient management and market sensitivity with democratic producer control.[41]

In a 1921 statement on trade, C.H. Burnell maintained that "the law of supply and demand can only be temporarily abrogated. Ultimately it makes itself felt and adjustments are made in harmony with that law." The UFM president went on to argue in his convention address that the solution to agricultural depression lay in "adopting a trade policy based on sound economic principles — a policy that will discard the fallacious principle that trade is necessarily war, and will recognise that trade is a matter of mutual advantage to buyer and seller." Hence, the emphasis in discussions of the tariff and protection had shifted over twenty-five years from the politics of monopolist oppression to the economics of market distortions

and trade impediments. In this new agrarianism, farmers required wider markets for their productive output and a freer market in the inputs and consumer items they purchased. Protectionism continued to be "essentially inequitable, immoral and vicious" in this ideology, but marketing and trade considerations were paramount:

> 1. It [the tariff] artificially restricts and hampers the exchange of products — exchange which is natural, legitimate and of mutual advantage. ...
> 2. It takes large sums of money from consumers generally without any possibility of their knowing how much is taken, into whose hands it passes, or for what purpose it is expended. ...
> 3. It leads business and manufacturing interests to depend upon arbitrary enactment and not upon natural economic conditions and necessities for their industrial progress. ...
> 4. It is a system so vicious in its fundamental essence that through all its history, in this country and in other countries, it has invariably been found lending itself to frequent manipulation by class interests for their advantage at the expense of others.[42]

The concepts of productive technique and farm management were part of the movement's economic vocabulary as well, but these were subordinate to issues such as marketing and transportation. The main initiatives of the movement affected management and production in two ways. On the one hand, better farming and better farm business methods were seen to result inevitably from the movement. The Pool contributed to better farming, for example, by allowing farmers to market their crops in an orderly fashion throughout the year, which, it was said, meant farmers were better able to properly husband their land. And, according to the MGGA:

> Beside helping you to better farming, the movement is designed to help you to better business success. ... The Grain Growers' movement has already done much to improve the business of farming both as regards distribution of supplies and as regards disposing of products. ... Now is your opportunity of getting into the movement for the opportunity it affords of bettering your business.[43]

On the other hand, the movement had to be careful not to neglect farm management as it took on the larger questions. The *Guide*, while focussing most of its attention on marketing strategies and politics, editorialized from time to time on the need for farmers to engage in "education, organization and co-operation" in order to conduct their "business on economic lines." Similarly, the UFM president often alluded to the importance of farm management as an area of organizational involvement. In 1925, for example, President A.J.M. Poole implored United Farmers not to overlook "the importance of efficiency in farm management and operation" as "the profit determining factor in agricultural production." Hence, whereas farm management, production and individual entrepreneurship tended to receive primary emphasis in the dominant ideology, in conservative agrarianism these were subordinated to the larger profit determinants of market manipulation and countervailing action.[44]

Rural society consisted of a series of problems requiring resolution in conservative agrarianism. The executive of the MGGA urged in 1919 that a department be established at MAC "in order that the varied problems of rural life" be given careful study, the country life report and philosophy figured prominently in the MGGA's *Rural Citizenship*, and the central question in the UFM's 1928 membership questionnaire was "Is There a Farm Problem."

The central social element in the solution was the notion of community. In a 1918 MGGA pamphlet, the question "What has the movement done" was posed. The second recorded accomplishment (in a list of ten) was that it had "helped to educate toward real knowledge of public issues and real community consciousness and efficiency." And, in a 1921 *Managra* article, W.R. Wood (UFM Secretary) suggested that one of the primary achievements of the UFM was that it had helped farmers learn the lesson of community life, which was that their lives were interrelated.[45] But the concept of community had variable intonations. There were essentially two types of community. On the one hand, there was the broad national community comprised of different interest groups. On the other hand, there was the rural community inhabited by families and individuals. Within this discourse, the farm movement increasingly saw itself as an instrument for constructing local community cohesion and participating in the pursuit of national community harmony.

At the national level, agriculture and the farm population sought to cooperate with other classes or groups. The sense of farmers being part of a constituency of producers receded, and was replaced by the image of grain growers as one of a series of interest groups in society. This perspective was present in the MGGA as early as 1904 but, at that time, it was still cast in terms of radical analysis. "This," President J.W. Scallion proclaimed in justifying the organizing efforts of grain growers,

> is an age of huge organizations, combinations and trusts. Every manufacturing industry, every profession is thoroughly united for the purpose of promoting its own special interest by procuring favorable legislation and otherwise; and nearly all legislation is but a compromise between contending interests.

Twelve years later the Council of Commerce and Agriculture (consisting of businessmen and farmers) was launched to provide "a medium whereby interests that have very often appeared antagonistic may be brought into closer touch with each other and given an opportunity of looking at things from each others viewpoint." And, in an MGGA pamphlet, it was noted that the organization had won "respectful recognition among the organised interests of the nation, and a fuller chance for a square deal." This cooperation and recognition was pursued in the name of community. The first two objects of the MGGA constitution, for example, sought:

> a) The all around development of rural life with a view to making it as satisfying and as effective in the commonwealth as possible, and the establishment of right relationships between rural and urban communities;
> b) To forward in every honorable and legitimate way the interests of the rural population, not in antagonism to other elements of our population, but in cordial co-operation with all.[46]

At the local, rural-settlement level, the movement was actively engaged in the creation of a pan-community identity. In the ascent from individual through familial to community self-consciousness, the authors of the "UFM Handbook of Practical Work" maintained, UFM activists should play a prominent role.

> The human individual only gradually comes to full self-consciousness. The human community comes much more slowly to its full self-consciousness. Family self-consciousness is reached sooner, but we cannot be satisfied until the community realizes itself and begins to live its corporate life. ... Just as a family has its conferences and consultations, so the community must talk over its interests and

> prospects. If there is a weakness or a difficulty that may be overcome by concerted effort, the community ought to work together on it. ... The local board of the United Farmers' Association ought to be leading in the work. ... Help your community to full self-consciousness.[47]

Hence, a 1918 convention resolution urged local organizations to:

> Unify and inspire the local community for its fullest self-consciousness and its most efficient activity; Enlist the sympathetic co-operation of all the best elements, the finest moral spirit, the best trained intellect in the community for the cause; ... Encourage the development of effective community workers and leaders.[48]

Through organizations such as the Bureau of Social Research, the Grain Growers and United Farmers were linked with other organizations, such as the churches, schools, and agricultural societies, in breaking down "partisan and sectarian walls" and encouraging community enterprises.

The most significant change in the political language of the Manitoba farm movement between the 1890s and the 1920s was the transformation of the Patrons' version of nonpartisanship into the citizenship of the UFM. Citizenship was the political equivalent of economic cooperation and social community in conservative agrarianism.

What was rural citizenship, and what was its place in agrarian political practice? In 1921 the UFM President told his convention audience that:

> every citizen ... must set himself to live for a citizenship of intelligent and conscientious participation in public life, and every group must devote itself to co-operative and sympathetic investigation of conditions and discussion of principles and methods by which evils may be averted and the people's true well-being promoted.

His predecessor claimed that the farm movement trained women and men in citizenship "in order to fit them, when the occasion should arise, to be the mouthpiece of their class in farming [*sic*] such legislation as would tend to place our economic burdens more equitably upon the shoulders of all classes of the people."[49] This residual language of class was somewhat at odds with a language of citizenship. More appropriate was the suggestion in an organizational pamphlet from the early 1920s that the "farmers of this country are not a class; they are the majority of the Canadian people ... [and] they are awakening to a fuller consciousness of their responsibility in all that makes for citizenship." Essentially this responsibility meant cooperating and seeking common ground with other groups. R.C. Henders, addressing the 1916 Joint Committee on Commerce and Agriculture, cast agrarian relations with bankers and manufacturers in these terms. He explained that farmers, in seeking to influence legislation, "welcomed the co-operation of other interests, and felt sure that all interests only desired a square deal."[50]

With its entry into electoral politics, the UFM had the opportunity to put this notion of citizenship into practice. There were five fundamental principles enunciated in the 1922 political platform: the "Spirit of Good Will," which held that democratic citizenship was "practically co-operative goodwill"; the "Ideal of Common Good," through which the seeking of class advantage was repudiated in favour of the well being of the whole people; the "Co-operative Method," which meant working with those who had common objectives; the "Law of Progress," to

"maintain and promote the forward looking attitude"; and "Citizenship the Basic Problem," whereby the fundamental task of government was to provide all with education for citizenship. The platform also noted that, since the UFM was much more than simply a political organization, the association should retain its independence from any and all governments. This, of course, extended to a "UFM" government as well. Indeed, as George Chipman argued immediately after the 1922 election:

> the farmers have problems that simply cannot be reduced to questions of politics alone ... and, to complete the work accomplished on July 18, the farmers of Manitoba should set themselves the task of making the UFM a thoroughly representative organization, covering the whole field of ways and means of improving the conditions of rural life and developing a creative citizenship.[51]

A sense of the distance and autonomy between movement and administration, as part of the ideology of citizenship, was conveyed in a memorandum submitted by the UFM board to the UFM government in the fall of 1922. Urging certain reforms, the board prefaced its suggestions by stressing "that these recommendations are made with no thought or intention of any attempt at dictation, but with cordial goodwill and the desire to be of practical assistance in promoting the well being of the province and the true efficiency of public administration."[52]

The reality, of course, was that the sort of nonpartisanship that became known as Brackenism was a practical rendering of this ideology. In a "legislative review" at the 1926 UFM convention, Bracken presented his political philosophy through a recollection of the situation that gave rise to the formation of the farmer government. "There had been," he began, "a clash of partisan and class interests in which manufacturer, artisan, farmer, manual labourer, merchant, salaried employee, professional man and others of all classes had sought the advancement of their own interests as opposed to those of other classes." This divisiveness, he continued, coupled with the partisanship of the "historic political parties," produced a situation in which "a businesslike and economical administration of Provincial affairs, with very considerable retrenchment in expenditure, was absolutely necessary to save the Province from disaster." Hence, "the UFM decided to take action politically." The Premier concluded by telling his audience that the aim of his government had been to give the province honest, progressive, efficient and patriotic administration, which meant the following:

> honest, because that is an indispensable quality which any Government should possess as trustees for the people — progressive, so that its whole outlook shall be forward looking and advanced, ... efficient, because the financial condition of the province then as never before demanded a businesslike and economical administration ... and patriotic because it was bound to regard the best interests of all the people and not solely any particular class of people.[53]

The citizenship and service that constituted UFM political practice in both the government and the association, therefore, was subordinate to the broader economic and social imperatives of cooperation and community.

But, precisely because they were social phenomena, cooperation, community and citizenshp had to be consciously created. Hence, the most important aspect of organizational work in conservative agrarianism was the education of members and potential members. According to W.R. Wood, general secretary during the later 1910s and early 1920s, a shift had taken place in the movement's history:

> In the early days of our organization, our time and thoughts were principally concerned in dealing with the grievances and disabilities in connection with the marketing and transportation of our produce, but now, while we do not neglect these things, we recognize our obligations in regard to developing a fully efficient citizenship on the part of our people, and much of the energy of our local associations is being directed toward educational development and efficiency in rural leadership.[54]

Under Wood's impressive direction, numerous local and provincial educational programs were organized. "As rural people," one pamphlet noted,

> we must be in touch with what is happening in the world. We must know about our relationship with other interests and other groups of citizens. We must understand the tendencies of trade and industry, and be prepared to take our rightful place in working out equitable adjustments.

This process was called "education for citizenship," which meant:

> [knowing] not only how to grow wheat, but how to market it... [knowing] how to act as a member or an officer of an agricultural society or a school board... [being] acquainted by practice with working in association with neighbors... [and knowing and feeling that one] exists to serve his community. ... In a word, Education in our democracy must practically prepare for co-operative participation in the ordinary service of the community life.

Therefore the UFM political platform called for the whole educational process to be imbued with "the ideal of preparing for co-operative service and civic duty," with rural schools working toward "the unifying of our population, the development of community efficiency and the raising of the standard of citizenship."[55] Education, then, was the way in which individuals were moulded into social beings. By first awakening people to the fact they were social, then training them to act socially, the movement would, it was hoped, produce an economically, politically and socially conscious collectivity.

In the end, these various levels produced a reformed public persona for farm men. In *Deep Furrows* (1918), which might be described as an "official" association history of the farm movement, Hopkins Moorhouse contrasted the organized "New Farmer" with the pre-Sintaluta "Hayseed." Of the farmer of old, he wrote,

> it seemed that he had no business! He merely grew the grain. Apparently a farmer was a pair of pants, a shirt and a slouch hat that sat on a wagon-load of wheat, drove it up the incline into the elevator and rattled away again for another load!

But this began to change with the Manitoba Grain Act and the Sintaluta case. For the railways, the court decision on car distribution meant "that the time had come to recognize the fact that there was a man inside the soil-grimed shirt." Farmers, meanwhile, "began to appreciate ... the task which faced these energetic men in successfully handling the giant organization for which they assumed responsibility." They both, therefore, "began to entertain for the other a greater respect." Ten years later, during the "Siege of Ottawa," the Grain Growers were popularly referred to as "Sod-Busters." "It was rather startling to find them," Moorhouse noted, "merely a new type of Business Farmer." It was, he concluded, "a far-seeing, clear-thinking New Farmer who has come forward in the last decade. Through his associations, his marketing experiences, his contact with railways and banks and manufacturers and governments he has become a student of economics."[56]

The ignorant, biased and individualistic sodbuster and hayseed gave way to the knowledgeable, respectful and organized rural businessman in Moorhouse's account. In the MGGA and UFM organizational literature, the businessman was also a community citizen. Through improvements in business organization and community life, it was said, "we have raised the whole social status of farm life until today, the farmer is no longer termed a moss-back, or hayseed, but is recognised as a citizen equally competent and efficient with all others in the community." And, more forcefully:

> He knows the place of agriculture among national industries. His range of thought is enlarged. His views are listened to by members of other groups. He is, in the fullest sense of the word, a man among men.[57]

He was, simply, the ultimate product and personification of the movement. The movement, after all, had become more concerned with socializing and raising the status of farm people than with facilitating radical social change. The farm man, given an apparently equal standing with corporate officials on the economic terrain or a legitimate claim to democratic citizenship on the political terrain, was a worthy and fulfilled man. Ironically, however, the ideal UFM man ceased to be recognizable as a farmer in any meaningful sense; he simply became another citizen, community participant and businessman, albeit a rural and agricultural one.

Residual Radicalism

Although the dominant categories had mostly displaced radical categories in popular agrarian ideology by the 1920s, a radical analysis continued to be evident in the Manitoba farm movement throughout the first quarter of the twentieth century. To be sure, it was stronger earlier in the century and weaker later, but it was present nevertheless. It is possible to discern a pattern of post-Patronist radical discourse that, while less overtly political, utopian and resistant than its nineteenth-century predecessor, was a significant, though increasingly subordinate, component of Manitoba agrarianism.

In proposing a resolution in favour of government ownership of elevators at the 1908 MGGA convention, the mover declared that "[t]he time has come for farmers to assume the control of their own storage facilities and derive for their labor its full returns." Two years later, W.D. Lamb of Plumas (Manitoba) provided this statement with some analytical depth in a letter to the *Guide*. To answer the question "Will government elevators pay?" which was frequently posed in those years, Lamb responded by asking rhetorically "Who pays for the elevators?" It was farmers and workers, of course. An elevator, he maintained, was a product of human labour. Labour produced the lumber, nails and paint, and put the building together. "It is not capital that erects elevators," then, "but labor. Capital itself is a labor product and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. The capitalists are men with money, the stored up labor of other people." Furthermore, the labour of farmers produced the crops, without which the elevators (and railways and implement companies) would have no business. "But farmers 'own' none of these things, although it is their labor that produces them." Hence, he concluded, government elevators would "pay" in the sense that farmers would finally own and control, through the government, the wealth they had created.[58] A labour theory of value continued to be employed in the movement, then, although with a slightly more agrarian tone than had existed in the 1890s. In a broader indictment later in 1910, the president of the Gilbert Plains Grain

Growers' Association asked the rhetorical question "Why is Canada prosperous?" and answered using explicitly producerist language:

> Your government had $100,000,000 of a revenue last year. Where did the money come from? Your manufacturers are millionaires. Where did their money come from? Your railroad magnates and charter mongers are rolling in wealth, even your merchants are prosperous. Is it because Liberals or Conservatives rule? Or is it because of the millions of toilers who are producing the wealth from mother earth? The miners, [the] lumberjacks, the mossbacks are producing the wealth of Canada.[59]

This oppressive and exploitative class was defined, for the most part, in terms of monopoly, although, by the century's second decade, "interest" was beginning to displace "monopoly" in many speeches and texts that were otherwise governed by radical premises. Early MGGA convention discussions and resolutions, for example, were often framed in terms of monopoly, as in a 1910 speech by J.D. Hunt on the background to the elevator question: "railroad monopoly has come in a great many different disguises. Its latest and sweetest form was a great big wooly Elevator combine."[60] The single tax, meanwhile, a popular cause in the farm movement, was an important medium for discussing monopoly in the early twentieth century. J.H. Richards of Chater argued in 1914 that monopoly and combination, but especially the land monopoly, "is the power that enslaves our people and fills the land with poverty and want." But, he claimed, "when the Single Tax is fully and completely adopted ... the toiler will then receive the just reward for his toil, and his limbs will no longer bear the fetters of industrial slavery." And, as late as 1920, the UFM page of the *Guide* contained a song entitled "Big Interests" which was clearly radical in inspiration:

> We have in this country a wonderful thing,
> Though scarcely a topic of which one should sing;
> The fact is, though strange how it e'er came to pass,
> We live 'neath the sway of a Governing Class.
>
> They weren't set up by the B.N.A. Act,
> But that they now rule is the surest of fact;
> They've no place by right in the ship of the realm,
> But surely as sure they preside at the helm.
>
> ... And so from the toilers from poor and from rich,
> From labor, from farmer, with never a hitch,
> They draw them a tribute to pile in their banks,
> And never a soul who contributes get thanks.
>
> ... "Who are they?" the Barons of High Tariff Town,
> By an ancient N.P. made the lords of renown;
> First they rule through the Tories and then through the Grits
> Till the H.C. of L. [high cost of living] drives us out of our wits.[61]

More significant than these scattered references were the persistent radical definitions of oppressors and oppression in MGGA presidential addresses. At the 1911 meeting, R.C. Henders drew attention to "a lack of interest and sympathy that seems to exist between the governments of our country and the great wealth producing class of our population, while on the other hand capitalistic and combination interests seem to experience very few if any of these disabilities and inconveniences." The following year, reverting to the language of monopoly, he made the connection between political power and economic domination more explicit:

> Oppression by an aristocracy of industrial monopolists is as bad as oppression by an aristocracy of political monopolists. ... We are governed by an elective aristocracy which in its turn is largely controlled by an aristocracy of wealth. Behind the governments and the legislatures are the corporations and trusts. Behind the machines, the rings, and the bosses are the business monopolists, the industrial combinations, and the plutocrats; behind the political monopolists are the industrial monopolists.

Later in the decade, Henders analyzed the causes of the high cost of living. Class legislation and economic injustice, he claimed, began with the acquisition of land. Land fell into the hands of a few, and its rising value created fortunes. Since the creation of wealth was social, however, some people suffered when others took more than their share out of the common product. He concluded, therefore, that the "power to extort surplus and unearned increment is at the root of every economic and social wrong because ... it not only creates poverty in one class, but it lessens the total wealth of the community."[62]

The tariff, while increasingly viewed as simply a market impediment in the twentieth century, did continue to be viewed within the Manitoba farm movement, by some and at times, as a political instrument of class exploitation. "The protective system," the MGGA leadership told Laurier in 1910, "creates a class whose interests are essentially different from the people at large," and, J.W. Scallion added, it was "a breeding ground and shelter for combines and trusts which prey upon the individual life of the people."[63] This class, created by political means, secured and enforced laws to protect its economic interests. "Therefore," Grain Grower delegates were told in 1913, "if we have a class which owns a large part of the national wealth we may expect that that class will see to it that the vast power exerted by the machinery of government is exerted in its interests," and most notably by means of the tariff. Farmers and workers were compelled "to contribute a large percentage of the products of their labor to the privileged and protected classes" through the tariff. This method of "collecting taxes," which put "the burden on the backs of working people" and exempted the rich, resulted in a concentration of wealth that had "become the mightiest undercurrent in national life." According to one grain grower, this "power to tax" was "the power to destroy one class to build up and enrich other classes." And the tariff's significance in economic and social life, the MGGA president said in 1913, was that, "in short, we cannot enjoy economic equality without political equality."[64] The tariff, therefore, symbolized and was the most significant manifestation of a corrupted state.

A corrupted state, of course, was accompanied by corrupted political practice, and a radical sense of both inherited politics and the possibilities of a new producerist politics lived on in the MGGA as well. J.B. Parker, in his 1910 account of "The Farmer in Politics and Commerce," sketched a portrait of the old-style political farmer:

> At Grandview I saw one of our farmer candidates on his own political platform, with a muzzle on, and two corporation lawyers were pleading his case for him. One of these lawyers ... said that when he read Sam Hughes was elected, we would hear him cheering all the way from Winnipeg. The love of these corporation lawyers for the farmers' candidate is very touching.

J.W. Scallion, in addressing the 1912 MGGA convention as honourary president, decried the lingering party divisions among farmers. "All other classes can unite for their common benefit," he lamented, "[but] farmers alone are divided and

conquered by the predatory interests and their political tools, and just as long as farmers are more concerned for the success of a political party than for their common good, present economic conditions will continue" "The interests," on the other hand, supported any party or government they could use as a business asset and opposed those they could not use.[65] But this sort of partyism would be transcended by the people — farmers and workers — uniting to create a new politics. The radical variant of this vision persisted through the postwar period and into the 1920s. So, in 1918, a *Guide* contributer could write:

> let us get close to labor. ... We are the same people, we all work for a living. ... Legislation that is bad for one is bad for the other; and what is more important, if farmers remain as a class by themselves and wage earners in another class by themselves, neither caring for the others interests, neither will be able ever to combat the power of the big interests.[66]

More importantly, in the UFM "Farm Problem" questionnaire of 1928, while most of the answers were structured in terms of market economics and social cooperation, some of the responses to the question "What is the solution?" (to the agricultural depression) reveal that the dominant categories did not completely control agrarian discourse in the 1920s. One local, invoking Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, suggested that "the only solution to the problem is ... state socialism and the abolition of money as we have it." Another local advocated "revision of the banking system making it work for the good of the people and not to make profit. The ultimate solution is the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth, production for use and not for profit. The Capitalistic system lies at the bottom of all our troubles."[67] This presaged newer political organizations and analyses that moved beyond radicalism to protosocialist and socialist forms.

The analysis that was preeminent in the postwar Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the United Farmers of Manitoba subordinated inherited Patronist elements to categories drawn from the dominant ideology. By the 1920s, market, community and citizenship displaced class, politics and producerism as the main organizing principles of Manitoba's male agrarianism. Patronism had been characterized by the determining unity of the political. In the twentieth century this unity was deconstructed, and then reconstructed around the discrete elements of economy, society, politics and education, in which the economic and social were determinant. The market and cooperation defined the economic realm, the social realm was viewed in terms of community and cohesiveness, citizenship and service defined the political realm, and the educational realm encompassed the subjective acquisition of these various aspects of knowledge. The new unity, personified by the ideal MGGA/UFM man, subordinated the popular movement to practices that supported rather than challenged the structures of power. Radicalism, while subdued, was not defeated, however. It lived on as a subtext of the movement, laying the linguistic foundation for the left insurgencies of the 1930s and 1940s.

Female Agrarianism

The formation of the women's section of the MGGA at the 1918 convention marked the first organizational expression of female agrarianism in Manitoba. Although women may have been involved individually in the Patrons and earlier formations — as they were in the MGGA from 1912 — they did not exist as distinct entities in those pioneering groups. In contrast with their urban, middle-class

sisters who struggled for suffrage, Manitoba farm women were rather slow to organize. Indeed, organized female agrarianism was a postsuffrage phenomenon, becoming a force only after women had won the vote in the province. It was against a popular background of male agrarian and middle-class feminist agitation that the vocabulary of the women's agrarian movement was constructed. On the one hand, middle-class feminism created a space for discussion of the political, economic and social status of women. The women's section of the farm press, often staffed by suffrage feminists, kept farm women informed about the struggles and actions of middle-class women. More importantly, though, these publications provided a forum for readers to discuss and assess their own experiences as farm wives and daughters. On the other hand, the radical language of the men's movement, although somewhat less resistant by the late 1910s, imparted a critical and class tone to the analysis that developed. Like the men's movement in the same time period, however, this analysis was constrained by the dominant ideology.

The ideological space created by middle-class feminism allowed farm women to contemplate their domestic existence as a problem with identifiable causes and possible solutions. The central questions then, as now, revolved around whether or not men were responsible for the difficulties and oppressions women faced. Were women to blame for their own predicament? Were men really the problem? Or, were men merely the victimized intermediaries in a larger system? Two series of letters from *The Farmers' Advocate* of 1897 and 1905 illustrate this debate.

Both series began with a criticism of men. One correspondent in 1897 cited the case of a southern Manitoba farmer who, attempting to build a kitchen onto his house as cheaply as possible, refused to accede to his wife's request to include a cellar for storing milk. "The good wife got angry," readers were told, "and threatened to make a public exposure of the disadvantages of a farmer's wife, telling these dairy lecturers [who happened to be visiting the farm at the time] that it was not knowledge we wanted so much as a chance to put what we know into practice." She concluded that,

> if every woman was to strike for better accommodation and reasonable house improvements it would be the beginning of better times. Until an improved lot of men help their struggling wives and daughters by providing better facilities for carrying on their part of the work there cannot be anything but discontent.[68]

Eight years later, and with more forceful language, farm men were indicted for treating their wives with contempt. There were many women, this writer claimed, who had to build their own henhouses and garden fences because men would not, clean up after men when they tracked manure and mud into the house, and endure men's curses when they requested things. This, she said,

> is really a true picture of by far the greater number of farmer's homes in some vicinities, and it is the lack of all that constitutes a real home that makes women detest the farm. ... How would the same conduct appear in the eyes of the public, if it were acted between man and man? The usurper would be justly called a plain thief. Does it make the action noble or honest because it is only a helpless woman he is defrauding? ... It remains in the hands of the farmer to remedy this evil.[69]

Other letters pointed to a double standard existing on most farms whereby men enjoyed fine horses, fine barns and every form of farm technology while the women — "the hardest worked and poorest used of anyone in the country" — were struggling with meagre resources to make the home comfortable and attractive. "Farmers should appreciate everything their wives do," one said, "and not

look upon them as if they were a machine or a football; they are human beings and want to be treated as such."[70]

There were two types of responses to these criticisms. One was to blame women for their predicament. Hence, one woman wrote in 1905 proclaiming that she had just married an OAC graduate who was truly a gentleman. In her mind, it was a woman's own fault if she was a slave. There were brutish men who enjoyed submitting women to drudgery, she conceded, but she felt a woman should simply refuse to do such work![71] In a somewhat similar, though far less strident vein, a more experienced woman related how she had been married to a farmer for fourteen years. With a household ranging in size from six to ten, she did all her own sewing, housework and quilting, milked the cows, churned, picked apples and dried them, and always had time for fancy work and reading. She concluded that life was what one made it, and it disgusted her to hear people talk of the drudgery of farm work in an age of cheese factories, creameries and other conveniences.[72] The other response, which later became the dominant ethos in the farm women's movement, was to defend men while criticizing the larger system that exploited both women and men. Men were too busy with their own work to improve domestic arrangements, the argument went in one letter, and the fundamental problem was a lack of capital on the farm. If the government reduced freight rates and the burden of taxation, farmers would have the money to improve working conditions for themselves and their wives.[73]

When a systematic analysis emerged after 1918, farm movement women adopted the male language of radicalism to link the position of women in the home to the political struggles of farm men. Within the Women Grain Growers and the United Farm Women, the tariff, as the symbol of agrarian political oppression, was viewed as a mechanism that specifically exploited women as well as men. Farm women, according to this view, had an equal status with men in the producing class. "Agriculturists in Canada, and that term must include also the farmer's wife," Mary McCallum wrote in 1919, "produce a wealth equal to all others, yet there is no class which uses and enjoys smaller returns for its labor." And, since it was estimated that one-fifth of farm income was extracted by the tariff, she lost one-fifth of the value of the eggs, butter, and cream she produced. "How long," it was asked, "will women be content to give one-fifth of all their time, their labor, and their produce to the enrichment of the few plutocrats who benefit by the tariff?" Furthermore, the farm wife also felt the exploitative effects of the tariff in her role as chief consumer for the home. It was especially oppressive in the kitchen, "the housekeeper's workshop." McCallum claimed that the farm woman, "each year, on things she buys for use in her kitchen alone, pays more in taxes than is levied directly on an entire half-section farm for all purposes." Hence, when these various aspects of the tariff's operation were combined, women were found to suffer *more* than men:

> Women and children have been the special victims of the tariff ever since there was a tariff. Homes have been robbed and families reduced to penury because of the tariff. From the time a woman is born until she dies she is fraudulently though legally bereft of the returns of her labor through the tariff. ... It is an unseen, unsuspected presence, closer than a brother, nearer than mother or father, but exerting an influence that is fiendishly sinister and absorbing.

It was little wonder, then, that so many farm homes lacked the simplest labour-

saving devices or the smallest comforts. On the one hand, the price of household items was inflated because of the tariff and, on the other, there was little money available in any event because virtually all of the farm income went into the purchase of farm machinery and farm supplies. And to add insult to injury, it was noted in passing, the tariff favoured rich women at the expense of poor women by invariably taxing necessities at a higher rate than luxuries.[74]

It was within this discursive context that the UFWM made a submission to the Tariff Commission in October of 1920. "In presenting my paper putting forth claims for redress of Tariff oppressions for an oppressed people, the agriculturist," Mrs. James Elliot of the UFWM said in introduction, "I offer no apologies. All my statements are facts gleaned from actual toiling agriculturists (men and women)." The submission, in fact, was based on a survey undertaken by the UFWM to ascertain the conditions under which farm women were working. This popular appropriation of the survey method revealed families living under difficult conditions in which women were forced to work long hours with little technological or human assistance. Of the forty-eight women surveyed, for example, all rose between 4:30 and 7:00 in the morning, and all but five ended their working day between 9:00 and 11:00 in the evening. None of the households had water in the kitchen, two had cistern pumps, none had hard water without hauling or carrying, none had a bath, and only seven had an indoor winter toilet. Although every home had a sewing machine, "in order to get the greatest possible results out of the women," the only other labour-saving devices were egg beaters, dust and floor mops, potato parers, and a few power churns. Every one of these items, it was noted, bore a tariff. Sewing machines had a rate of $14, which meant that a total of $670 was extracted from the forty-eight households through sewing machines alone. But it was the cost of clothing that was particularly repulsive to the UFWM, because it was this that caused children to suffer the most. It was pointed out to the commissioners that woollen garments — a necessity for the Manitoba winter — were simply too expensive for most people to buy. "The brutality of it all," Mrs. Elliot protested, "is the manufacturers realize the labouring people, which includes farmers, cannot pay the price, hence few, very few woollen articles are secured by our country stores." "Why," she asked, "must such brutality be exploited on the little children?" "In the face of such conditions," she concluded, "can anyone deny the reasonableness of the request to lower the tariff restrictions on the needs of the home makers of our land."[75]

But this use of the tariff symbol represented more than an appropriation of radical terms. It also revealed that women viewed their oppression as being a part of the exploitation of all farm people. As women grain growers were reminded in 1919, during a review of their varied activities, "it is well not to lose sight of the purpose of the organization, that it was established primarily to help the farm people by educating them to understand the economic and political influences that affect the agricultural class."[76] Furthermore, the first clause of the women's constitution ("women shall have the same standing in the association as men") was understood to exclude the notion of distinct women's and men's sections. Rather, the MGGA was perceived as an association of women and men in which the women also had an autonomous section. Women, then, were members of their local grain growers' association first and members of the women's section second. Two separate bodies, it was argued, would mean separation and weakness, whereas an association with a women's section cooperating was "a demonstration

of the fact that the farm men and the farm women are in the organization for the promotion of their common interests, and that after all, most of the problems which concern either men or women concern both."[77]

The strength of this class identity was most strongly felt around the issue of the "Women's Party" in 1918. This imperialist, militarist, high tariff and anti-worker party, organized by prominent Toronto feminists close to the National Council of Women, was soundly criticized and rejected by farm movement women. And, in the process, the discussion helped crystallize women's thoughts about their relation to women from other classes and men of their own class. "It is possible for classes to unite on national policies," one farm woman concluded,

> but utterly impossible for sexes. A woman's party makes women's voice and opinion on public affairs as innaccessible [*sic*] as if they resided on Mars. Let us be done for ever with sex enterprises. They can't work. Let the farm people, men and women, make up the voice of agriculture. Let industrial or other workers, men and women, make up the voice of labor.[78]

With this image of themselves, farm movement women concentrated their energies on a range of activities born of the traditional domestic responsibilities. By 1925 there were seven committees in the UFWM to coordinate the various lines of endeavour. Emphasizing education, social welfare and legislation affecting women and children, the organization strove to improve social conditions and develop local tastes for the "finer things of life." In the area of legislation, for example, movement women monitored and sought changes in the fields of child welfare, divorce, marital property rights, naturalization for married women and education. At the local community level, meanwhile, they complemented the work of the Women's Institutes by engaging in Red Cross and patriotic work, maintaining rest rooms and libraries, or organizing musical, literary and educational evenings.[79] Cooperation between movement and institute women was partly a reflection of the extent to which the dominant ideology provided the vocabulary and defined the goals of the movement. For, while movement women employed the rhetoric of radicalism and were influenced by middle-class feminism, they were constrained by the categories of market, consumption, rural problem, community and education for citizenship. In a way which paralleled the new analysis in the male mainstream of the farm movement, then, the language used by movement women was ultimately defined by economic, social, political and educational categories drawn from rural social science.

For farm movement women, the economy was where they produced commodities for the market, consumed items from the market and experienced the injustice of their situation most acutely. It was, in the end, the most significant factor in the determination of rural conditions. "Should the stress of economic conditions," Mrs. James Elliot of Cardale (UFWM President) asked in 1923, "not be the one factor to bind the rural people together in this Association? 1922 gave a bountiful harvest but the cost of production and garnering was out of all proportion to the meagre pittance received for the grain." And, she continued two years later, "farm people must realize for themselves a greater share of the wealth which they produce that they may have the purchasing power necessary to establish ... homes," and achieve the educational, social and political goals of the organization.[80] More specifically, and with reference to a particularly offensive economic problem in the eyes of the farm movement, Mary McCallum made

a connection between land speculation and the condition of women. Because of the impossibility of finding reasonably priced land in the settled areas of the province, she argued, farm people were forced to homestead in unsettled regions. In a trip to such a district she found housing of the most basic, pioneering sort and, therefore, housekeeping "of the most difficult and discouraging kind." There were no telephones, nor was there mail delivery. More shocking was the fact that the nearest doctor was forty miles away; hence many women bore children without the aid of a doctor or a nurse. The profiteering of the land speculators, she concluded, "directly acts disastrously on our farm women," making this aspect of the economy very much a woman's problem.[81]

The central concept in UFWM discussions of domestic production was cooperative marketing. The marketing committee noted in 1921 that a general decline in agricultural prices meant farm women were receiving less for their butter, eggs and poultry. This made the cooperative method of marketing "an intensely woman's problem." "Our own one-hundred per-cent organized resistance, with intelligent co-operation," women were told later, "is the one thing that is needed to bring about better marketing conditions"[82] And, of course, women were connected to, and affected by, men's cooperative endeavours. The Pool, Tracy Patrick suggested in her "Pool Woman" column in 1925,

> can make her burden lighter — enable her to possibly see that little debt which worried her more than anyone knew, cleared up; make it possible for her to have certain little comforts for her home. ... And, just as the Wheat Pool has been instituted to help the woman on the farm, so the Pool wants and needs the help of that woman ... willing to cheerfully make temporary sacrifices and suffer certain temporary inconveniences in order that she, her family, and her neighbors may ultimately benefit.[83]

As much as the economic realm might determine conditions for farm women in this analysis, the most significant change occurred in the social realm. More precisely, the "rural problem" and its resolution were the categories through which society was most frequently contemplated in the movement. At their first convention in 1918, Irene Parlby of the United Farm Women of Alberta told Grain Grower women "that a common attitude of the old farmer was to consider that there is no rural problem, that things will adjust themselves if only left alone." She maintained, however, that there was a problem "and that a share of it is uniquely women's work." During the following decade the farm women's movement concentrated a goodly portion of its efforts on identifying and solving this putative problem. In 1925, for example, it was explained in a UFWM document that rural women had discovered that the improvement "of rural life can best be accomplished by systematically following a carefully prepared program." Hence, the UFWM board was divided into seven committees, "each responsible for undertaking research along lines vital to the welfare of the rural home."[84] This problem identification approach to rural society was clearly evident in the three rural surveys of farm women conducted between 1920 and 1923. The survey method, of course, was an integral part of the sociological definition of a social problem. In the first survey, done in preparation for the presentation to the Tariff Commission, movement women essentially appropriated the method for their own political purposes, using it to generate facts for a criticism of the tariff. The other two surveys, however, were not tied to an explicit political project. In these instances the social problem that was revealed was linked more closely to a purely social solution.

This social solution, as one might guess, was defined by the notion of community. Community existed along that continuum from individual to nation which constituted social life. And the farm women's movement, activists claimed, served individual, community and national purposes. It served the farm woman herself by bringing her into social contact with the women and men of the organization and the community, the community by awakening interest in community conditions, and the nation — the community of communities — by creating a higher standard of social life.[85] Moreover, women were crucial, if not central actors in community organizing. "No body of people has any real claim to call itself a community organisation," the UFM Handbook advised, "so long as it has not enrolled the women of the community in its ranks. For effective service along the lines of entertainment, social development and education, the help of the women must be enlisted." And what made women effective? One opinion, proffered by Mrs. J.S. Wood of the women's auxiliary of the Oakville Grain Growers' Association (and subsequently first president of the women's section of the MGGA), was that "with that innate desire to please, they are just the right sort to put forth that community spirit that is so necessary to the uplift of farm people."[86] While women's traditional role as servants was no doubt important, a more significant factor was the place of the home in the socialization and creation of community. The MGGA's *Rural Citizenship* placed the home firmly in the context of the rural problem when it asked "What is the farm home accomplishing? What are its needs? What are its possibilities? How can they be realised?" It answered that the rural home was a contradiction. On the one hand, the "sturdy manhood, wholesome womanliness, [and] high moral standards" of the rural home represented the highest development of home life, while, on the other, the rural home was plagued by "monotony, drudgery, petty jealousy, [and] conservatism." The farm movement, and movement women in particular, had a responsibility to overcome this contradiction by allowing the positive to flourish at the expense of the negative. Indeed, as Mrs W.H. English argued in 1916, the home "is the testing place [of the movement], and if we do our best there we are sure of trying to extend our influence to those around us. It is not enough to strive after 'Better Farms' and 'Better Stock' — we must extend it to our homes."[87] Most importantly, a number of women noted over the years, cooperation — the foundation of community for the farm movement — needed to begin at home. This might mean women cooperating with men by appreciating that improved farm technology had a higher priority than domestic labour-saving devices, or, more progressively, men assisting with domestic work to reciprocate for women helping with outside chores. "The problem of getting better social life in many of our communities" could be solved, Mary McCallum concluded, if farm women made their homes centres of "high ideals, true neighborliness and tolerance."[88]

Educational endeavours were especially important for farm movement women since they, like other women, were deemed to have responsibility for educating the young. At one level this concern was expressed by monitoring rural education. One of the main objectives of the MGGA Women's Section was better rural schools, which was pursued by studying the rural school problem at both a local and provincial level. In a 1921 UFWM Education Committee report on rural education, for example, consolidation and a larger administrative unit were offered as solutions to the problems of rural school attendance and the competency and turnover of rural teachers.[89] At another level, farm movement women experienced the broader

social anxiety over adolescence which had spawned the Boys' and Girls' Clubs. The Junior UFM, which operated under the direction of a UFWM committee, sought to bring youth into the purposes of the organization and the development of rural life. It was believed that young people, especially those around school-leaving age, were in danger of being lost to the "lure of city lights" or "narrow individualism" if a special effort was not made to "take the drudgery out of farm life" by offering them "social inducement and recreation" in the movement. This was especially critical because other youth organizations were failing to train the young. They were falling short of movement ideals, one report argued, in the same way "our public school system of textbooks fall short of properly training our rural boys and girls." Hence, the UFWM took on the responsibility of having the young people of their communities "come to know each other better, and thus learn to co-operate more effectively in all that makes for community betterment and national progress." A special effort was needed, then, to bring youth into the social world. "Like ourselves our boys and girls need development. They need the spirit of co-operation both in work and play." And this could be accomplished by moving beyond "book learning and general school work" to "[r]eal intrinsic education [which] comes when our Young People grapple with the economic, social and fiscal problems of the day." So the UFWM approached youth work by organizing around educational, economic, social and vocational themes. Essentially, this involved citizenship and leadership training, granting young people some economic autonomy (giving them their own livestock, for example), emphasizing farming's professional status and, most importantly, drawing youth into socially cooperative systems.[90]

For women themselves, education meant adequate and proper training for the responsibilities of political citizenship. Through papers and lectures with titles such as "The Woman's Part" or "Women and Service," movement women and intellectuals in the postsuffrage period prepared the new voters for their new public roles. The franchise, coupled with their formal entry into the MGGA, provided a great opportunity for women according to this analysis. They could begin to change some of the laws that were so unjust to women and children and, as well, lead the way into nonpartisan political behaviour. More importantly, though, this marked their entry into true community membership. "No community can accomplish its best purpose," Mrs Albert McGregor told the Winchester MGGA in 1916, unless it has "the loyal, devoted service of its whole citizenship." With women's political and organizational participation, this would be the case. Furthermore, there were ways in which women brought special qualities to citizenship. Through service in the home, Mabel Finch argued in 1918, "women's best qualities and highest powers are developed." Through service to the state, women's influence and experience in the home could be extended to the community and nation. Finally, with the acquisition of citizenship, women took their rightful place alongside men in the movement and in the affairs of state. After suffrage and MGGA membership, McGregor promised, "we do not expect to talk any more of the rights of women. We have our rights, and it will be a case of men and women working together." And, giving the radical inheritance a novel inversion, she concluded "woman ... will take her place by his side neither as parasite nor competitor, but as mate." So, through meetings, discussions, lectures and courses, movement women were "educated for citizenship"; that is, they were trained to work politically alongside men, but with special responsibility for issues in their own sphere, in creating stable rural and national communities.[91]

Female agrarianism never emerged as an autonomous force in Manitoba. Influenced to a certain extent by independent women's organizations, it was primarily a product of the main body of the agrarian movement. The oppositional tone that did exist in the ideology of the movement was derived from those radical strains that survived in the male agrarianism of the late 1910s and the 1920s. More importantly, though, the dominant ideology that was being systematically produced and disseminated by the postwar years provided the main vocabulary of the movement. While the movement's relative autonomy ensured that dominant issues and categories were not simply reproduced in the women's section of the MGGA and in the UFWM, the weakness of the radical alternative and the social distance of urban feminism meant that movement women nonetheless accepted the central concepts in the dominant view as meaningful renditions of their social and economic existence.

By the 1920s, the radical potential of Patronism had been constrained and displaced in the Manitoba farm movement by the emerging ideology of Brackenism. Political nonpartisanship gave way to business nonpartisanship as the oppositional elements in radicalism became less resistant and even accommodationist. After the election of 1922, the UFM moved slowly, but surely, into ideological alignment with the conservative mainstream of the provincial bourgeoisie. But the route from radicalism to conservatism was a complex one in which the movement's language was transformed.

SEVEN

Conclusion

The institutions of agricultural education that developed in Manitoba before 1925 were part of a broader North American pattern in agricultural education, education generally and state structures. In a thirty-five-year period the field of agricultural and domestic knowledge was systematized and professionalized through the emergence of specific disciplines at the college level, the tightening of central direction and control at the extension level, and the addition of agricultural and home economics subjects to school curricula. In the area of social knowledge, which has been the particular concern of this study, disciplinary apparatuses emerged in Manitoba to parallel broader North American developments, with agricultural economics, rural sociology and home economics employing the theoretical categories and methodological approaches of "American" domestic and rural social science. Below this formal organization of knowledge, the disciplinary boundaries receded as the practical interpellation of subjects proceeded and social identities were shaped.

There were two sides to the identities thus formed. As I argued in chapter two, there are two components of human knowledge: knowledge as a part of labour power (material) and knowledge as a region of ideology where meaning is constituted (ideal). Productive knowledge in agricultural and domestic labour was organized in terms of the indirect subordination of farm households to the capitalist market. The whole range of scientific and technical knowledge necessary for sustained and efficient market production, while not appropriated from producers according to the formal capitalist model, was nonetheless marshalled for the purposes of capitalist exchange. If business was to generate the largest possible surplus through its control of the factors market, the distribution market and the system of credit, it had to ensure that agricultural labour power was being applied as intensively as possible. Similarly, if labour power was to be efficiently applied and, more importantly, if surplus extraction by business was to extend as deeply into the household as possible, it had to ensure that domestic labour was applied intensively as well. To a large extent this proceeded through the market — notably the price system — whereby farm households became so entrapped in the circuits of capital that they had to participate continually in the market in order to survive. But it was reinforced through an educational state structure in which the natural and technical elements in agricultural and domestic production were linked to specific social relations.

Meaning was constituted on the foundation of productive knowledge, and social identities were built upon the contradictory elements in the work experience of farm people. But sustainable identities were difficult to create in farming since farmers owned their own instruments of production and controlled the production process, but were nonetheless effectively subordinated to business through the mechanism of exchange. In one light they appeared to be workers; in another light they took on the characteristics of capitalists. The dominant ideology played

on this vagueness to construct a bourgeois identity. Through marginalist economics, for example, the farm household acquired an equal standing with the capitalist firm in the marketplace. Both the farm manager and the household manager participated as entrepreneurs in the market, coordinating factors of production and consumption in response to demand and supply. And the rural component of academic sociology envisioned an ideological community linking farmers with other occupational groups (especially business groups) in defiance of factors which divided them. The radical vision of cooperation and community lost its cutting edge as it was generalized to embrace the enemies of old in the pursuit of social stability.

This bourgeois identity was cemented with the ideology of professionalism. Farm people were encouraged to see themselves as possessing a status equal to that of a traditional professional such as a doctor or a new professional such as a teacher. Professionalism represented a claim on middle-class identity, close to the respectable elements in society and at a distance from the working class. With a professional status to complement their bourgeois identity, farm people became technically proficient, socially integrated participants in a marginalist economy. Politics and questions of power became a separate domain subordinate to this particular rendering of society and economy.

By the 1920s, with an educational state and a dominant ideology in place, the mainstream of the Manitoba farm movement was safely in agreement with business as to the fundamental premises of the social and economic system. There was nothing inherently inevitable about this, however, and one would have been foolhardy to have predicted such a development in the 1890s. The dominant ideology had to confront and transform a subordinate ideology built with radical categories. The radical inheritance, which fuelled so many nineteenth-century popular movements, contained an analysis of the place of farming under capitalism that made sense of the comparable place of farmers and workers in the order of things. The emphasis on political corruption, political oppression and the political determination of social reality seemed an accurate depiction of life for Manitoba farmers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Patrons of Industry engaged in both "economic" and "political" activities but, really, the economic did not exist as a discrete entity in their analysis; the political — the exercise of state power — was always paramount. Radicalism continued to have a strong presence in the early years of the MGGA, but the language of the organization became more economic, and then social, as it increasingly incorporated the categories of rural social science into its outlook. And when the WGGA was formed in the late 1910s there was little oppositional tradition for women to draw upon. The subordinate ideology available to them was a radicalism sanitized by the dominant categories and a gender analysis weakened by its appropriation and transformation by middle-class women. By the time the MGGA/WGGA became the UFM/UFWM and entered politics, the political vision of the organization was defined primarily in terms of the economic, social and educational categories of the dominant ideology.

The profound social and economic changes of the period severely tested the inherited explanations of power relationships, especially in the face of well-reasoned, systematic analyses that seemed better equipped to make sense of the changes. More importantly perhaps, this new language gave farm people a

comfortable vocabulary with which to claim a place in the emerging order. Class oppression, while in many ways more prevalent in the new century than in the old one, was less comprehensible in terms of political corruption. The market was an apparently permanent reality. The main activities in the lives of men were better understood through economic categories. As domestic production and consumption became increasingly integrated into the market and the private was connected to the public realm, the lives of women made more sense in social and economic terms. Furthermore, when a social approach was presented it was clear that rural life did have a social element, and there were identifiable problems in rural society that required resolution. The young and the educational system, in particular, took on a new and at times disturbing significance when viewed in social terms. Politics became the means through which the conditions of ideological community and full market participation were achieved. In this new world, it seemed reasonable to discard the notion of class domination and replace it with an image of discrete socioeconomic groups that, while having different interests, could unite to ensure the health of the market or the stability of the community.

Radicalism, although it did have the power to mobilize massive constituencies in town and country, was a limited and doomed analysis. While it is true that the disciplinary boundaries and ideological categories of bourgeois social science produced a distorted view of economy and society, they did identify areas of social reality that required analysis, explanation and intervention. With its overriding emphasis on the political, radicalism was discursively quiet or derivative about these areas, thereby allowing the dominant analysis to take hold and flourish. The protosocialist, postradical analyses of agriculture, which developed in other areas of North America during the same period, built upon radicalism by devising a specifically politicoeconomic analysis that rejected the dominant image of the economy. But these ideas had little impact in Manitoba at the time, primarily because there were no socialist or other working-class-based organizations doing work in the countryside. In the absence of an alternative analysis that moved beyond radicalism's political categories to assess rural society through the lens of conflict and exploitation, the dominant view was destined to establish its hegemony in Manitoba.

Endnotes

Chapter 1

1. Michael Katz, Michael Doucet, and Mark Stern, *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982); Bruce Curtis, *True Government by Choice Men? Inspection, Education and State Formation in Canada West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Clyde W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).
2. Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1975).
3. Paul Voisey, *Vulcan: The Making of a Prairie Community* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).
4. Robert P. Swierenga, "Theoretical Perspectives on the New Rural History: From Environmentalism to Modernization," *Agricultural History* 56, no. 3 (1982); John L. Shover, *First Majority, Last Minority: The Transforming of Rural Life in America* (DeKalb: University of Illinois Press, 1976). A Canadian social-democratic variation on this theme is Ian MacPherson and John Thompson, "The Business of Agriculture: Prairie Farmers and the Adoption of 'Business Methods'," in *Canadian Papers in Business History*, vol. 1, ed. Peter Baskerville (Victoria: Public History Group, University of Victoria, 1989). MacPherson and Thompson, while sympathetic to the plight of farmers under capitalism, borrow the modernization theory of the American new rural history to argue that prairie farmers used business methods strategically to adapt to a modernizing agriculture.
5. Steven Hahn and Jonathan Prude, eds., *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation: Essays in the Social History of Rural America* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1985). I discuss the problems with a Eurocentric approach to rural western North America in more general theoretical terms in Jeffery M. Taylor, "Dominant and Popular Ideologies in the Making of Rural Manitobans, 1890-1925" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manitoba, 1988), chapter 1.
6. On the former see, for example, C.B. Macpherson, *Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962) or J.F. Conway, "The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy: Some Reconsiderations," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1979). For the latter see David Laycock, *Populism and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).
7. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Feminism Without Illusions: A Critique of Individualism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991) and Linda Gordon, *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence* (New York: Penguin, 1988), for example. While I find postmodern feminist texts such as Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) illuminating and useful, I do not accept the theoretical premises.
8. For example, Mary Kinnear, "'Do You Want Your Daughter to Marry a Farmer?': Women's Work on the Farm, 1922," in *Canadian Papers in Rural History*, vol. 6, ed. Donald H. Akenson (Gananoque, Ontario: Langdale Press, 1988); Veronica Strong-Boag, "Pulling in Double Harness or Hauling a Double Load: Women, Work and Feminism on the Canadian Prairie," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 21, no. 3 (Fall 1986); Carol Lee Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?: The Ideas of the English Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), chapter 8.

9. Vernon C. Fowke, *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957); W.L. Morton, *The Progressive Party in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950).
10. Gerald A. Friesen, *The Canadian Prairies: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984).

Chapter 2

1. Neither American nor Canadian society was "purely capitalist" in the sense that capitalist relations of production did not prevail in all production. Simple commodity production dominated in agriculture, and coexisted with capitalist relations of production in the larger society.
2. For an accessible guide to the way in which I use the term "capital" and its variations, see Francis Green and Bob Sutcliffe, *The Profit System: The Economics of Capitalism* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1987). In the interests of accessibility, I often use the term "business" when the term "capital" would be more precise.
3. H.C. Pentland, *Labour and Capital in Canada, 1650-1850* (Toronto: Lorimer, 1981), chapter 5; Gregory S. Kealey, *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), parts 1 and 2; Bryan D. Palmer, *Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1992), chapters 1, 2, and 3; Gregory S. Kealey and Bryan D. Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), chapter 1; Gregory S. Kealey, "The Structure of Canadian Working Class History," in *Lectures in Canadian Labour and Working Class History*, ed. W.J.C. Cherwinski and Gregory S. Kealey (St. John's: Committee on Canadian Labour History, 1985); Craig Heron and Robert Storey, "On the Job in Canada," in *On the Job: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada*, ed. Craig Heron and Robert Storey (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986); David M. Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982).
4. R.T. Naylor, *The History of Canadian Business*, vol. 2 (Toronto: Lorimer, 1975); Albert Chandler, *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977); William Lazonick, "Class Relations and the Capitalist Enterprise: A Critical Assessment of Marxian Economic Theory," unpublished paper, Harvard University, 1983: 30-47; Gabriel Kolko, *Main Currents in Modern American History* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), chapter 1; David Montgomery, *The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Craig Heron and Robert Storey, "Work and Struggle in the Canadian Steel Industry, 1900-1950," in Heron and Storey, *On the Job*; Gareth Stedman Jones, "Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution," in Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Karl Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), part 5.
5. Harriet Friedmann, "Household Production and the National Economy: Concepts for the Analysis of Agrarian Formations," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 7, no. 2 (January 1980); Harriet Friedmann, "Simple Commodity Production and Wage Labour in the American Plains," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 6, no. 1 (October 1978); Harriet Friedmann, "The Family Farm and the International Food Regimes," in *Peasants and Peasant Societies*, ed. Teodor Shanin (London: Basil Blackwell, 1987); David Goodman and Michael Redclift, *From Peasant to Proletarian: Capitalist Development and Agrarian Transitions* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981); see also Max J. Hedley, "Independent Commodity Production and the Dynamics of Tradition," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 13, no. 4 (November 1976); Max J. Hedley, "Reproduction and Evolving Patterns of Cooperation and Resource Transfer Among Domestic Producers," *Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 1, no. 2 (Winter 1980); Max J. Hedley, "Relations of Production of the 'Family Farm': Canadian Prairies," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 9, no. 1 (October 1981).

6. When I use the terms *farmer, farm household* or variations I mean simple commodity producers and simple commodity production. Furthermore, the term *farmer* means the household head who is primarily responsible for raising agricultural commodities for sale and for the nondomestic work in support of this function; in other words, it normally means the *farm man*. For the market orientation of prairie agriculture see, for example, Vernon C. Fowke, *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957; Ian MacPherson and John Thompson, "The Business of Agriculture: Prairie Farmers and the Adoption of 'Business Methods'," in *Canadian Papers in Business History*, vol. 1, ed. Peter Baskerville (Victoria: Public History Group, University of Victoria, 1989); Royden Loewen, "Ethnic Farmers and the 'Outside' World: Mennonites in Manitoba and Nebraska, 1874-1900," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1990). Of course there are peasant and capitalist exceptions to this general picture.
7. It should be stressed that I am making an argument about the global wheat economy here. The Canadian prairie farm economy was dominated by farm households from its beginnings.
8. This analysis of the global context of the wheat economy is drawn from Harriet Friedmann, "The Transformation of Wheat Production in the Era of the World Market, 1873-1935: A Global Analysis of Production and Exchange" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976), and Harriet Friedmann and Philip McMichael, "Agriculture and the State System: The Rise and Decline of National Agricultures, 1870 to the Present," *Sociologia Ruralis* 26, no. 2 (1989). See also Philip McMichael, *Settlers and the Agrarian Question: Foundations of Capitalism in Colonial Australia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985) and Philip McMichael, "State Formation and the Construction of the World Market," in *Political Power and Social Theory*, ed. Maurice Zeitlin (Greenwood: JAI Press, 1987). For an alternative account, which struggles against the bridle of mainstream economic history to suggest the significance of "property relations" in understanding the expansion of wheat production in this period, see Jeremy Adelman, "The Social Basis of Technical Change: Mechanization of the Wheatlands of Argentina and Canada, 1890-1914," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34, no. 2 (April 1992).
9. While the Chicago price recovered somewhat in 1929, the British import price fell continuously from 1925 to 1934. Friedmann, "The Transformation of Wheat Production," 85.
10. Friedmann, "The Transformation of Wheat Production," chapter 5; Fowke, *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy*, chapters 3, 4, and 5; Friesen, *The Canadian Prairies*, chapter 8.
11. Nineteenth-century prices are basis Montreal; all others are Number 1 Northern, cash basis Lakehead. See Fowke, *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy*; W.T. Easterbrook and Hugh J.C. Aitken, *Canadian Economic History* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1956), chapter 20; James Mavor, "Agricultural Development in the North-West of Canada, 1905-1909," *Report of the 79th Meeting of the Royal Academy for the Advancement of Science* (London: n.p., 1910), 223; George E. Britnell, *The Wheat Economy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1939), 50; Canada, *Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1886* (Ottawa, 1887), 164; Canada, *Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1896* (Ottawa, 1897), 189; Canada, *Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1901* (Ottawa, 1902), 89.
12. Fowke, *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy*, parts 2 and 3; Duncan A. MacGibbon, *The Canadian Grain Trade* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1932), part 2.
13. Fowke, *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy*, chapter 5; Naylor, *History of Canadian Business*, vol. 2, chapter 14; Robert W. Murchie, *Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1936), chapter 6.
14. W.T. Easterbrook, *Farm Credit in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1938), part 1; Naylor, *History of Canadian Business*, vol. 1, 104-7, 199-209; W.A. Mackintosh, *Economic Problems of the Prairie Provinces* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1935), chapter 12; Murchie, *Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier*, 76-83; T.D. Regehr, "Bankers

and Farmers in Western Canada, 1900-1939," in *The Developing West: Essays in Honor of Lewis H. Thomas*, ed. John E. Foster (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1983); Jeremy Adelman, "Prairie Farm Debt and the Financial Crisis of 1914," *Canadian Historical Review* 71, no. 4 (December 1990); David Jones, "An Exceedingly Risky and Unremunerative Partnership: Farmers and the Financial Interests Amid the Collapse of Southern Alberta," in *Building Beyond the Homestead: Rural History on the Prairies*, ed. David Jones and Ian MacPherson (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1985).

15. Wally Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power: A Comparative Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1983); Wally Seccombe, *A Millennium of Family Change: Feudalism to Capitalism in Northwestern Europe* (London: Verso, 1992).

16. Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), prologue and *passim*; Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *More Work For Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), chapter 4; Veronica Strong-Boag, "Keeping House in God's Country: Canadian Women at Work in the Home," in Heron and Storey, *On the Job*; Veronica Strong-Boag, *The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939* (Toronto: Copp Clark Pittman, 1988), chapters 4 and 5; see also Glenna Matthews, *"Just a Housewife": The Rise and Fall of Domesticity in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

17. Wally Seccombe, "The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism," *New Left Review* 83 (1974), and subsequent criticisms and rejoinder in the same journal; Bonnie Fox, ed., *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1980); Michelle Barrett, *Women's Oppression Today: The Marxist/Feminist Encounter* (London: Verso, 1989), 172-86; Lise Vogel, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983), part 4; Meg Luxton, *More Than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home* (Toronto: Women's Press, 1980).

18. Marjorie Griffin Cohen, *Women's Work, Markets, and Economic Development in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).

19. Royden Loewen, "'The Children, the Cows, My Dear Man and My Sister': The Transplanted Lives of Mennonite Farm Women, 1874-1900," *Canadian Historical Review* 73, no. 3 (September 1992); Angela Davis, "'Valiant Servants': Women and Technology on the Canadian Prairies 1910-1940," *Manitoba History* 25 (Spring 1993).

20. Paul Phillips has analyzed this phenomenon through the lens of unequal exchange. Paul Phillips, "Staples, Surplus and Exchange: The Commercial Industrial Question in the National Policy Period," in *Explorations in Canadian Economic History: Essays in Honour of Irene M. Spry*, ed. Duncan Cameron (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1985), 32-33, 39, 40; see also Paul Phillips, "Manitoba in the Agrarian Period, 1870-1940," in *The Political Economy of Manitoba*, ed. Jim Silver and Jeremy Hull (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, 1990) and Paul Phillips, "The Hinterland Perspective: The Political Economy of Vernon Fowke," *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1978).

21. Vernon C. Fowke, *Canadian Agricultural Policy: The Historical Pattern* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946); John McCallum, *Unequal Beginnings: Agriculture and Economic Development in Quebec and Ontario until 1870* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980); Robert Brenner and Mark Glick, "The Regulation Approach: Theory and History," *New Left Review* 188 (July/August 1991): 70-75; Mike Davis, "'Fordism' in Crisis: A Review of Michel Aglietta's *Regulation et crises: L'experience des Etats Unis*," *Review* (Binghampton) 2 (Fall 1978): 217-22; Charles Post, "The American Road to Capitalism," *New Left Review* 133 (May/June 1982): 48.

22. Michel Aglietta, *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience* (London: NLB, 1979), 78-79.

23. David Goodman, Bernardo Sorj and John Wilkinson, *From Farming to Biotechnology: A Theory of Agro-Industrial Development* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), chapters 1 and 2; David Goodman and Michael Redclift, *Refashioning Nature: Food, Ecology and Culture* (London: Routledge, 1991), chapter 3; Susan Archer Mann, *Agrarian Capitalism in Theory and Practice* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

24. Jacques Chevalier, "There is Nothing Simple about Simple Commodity Production," *Studies in Political Economy* 7 (Winter 1982): 114-18; see also K.F. Goss, Richard D. Rodefeld and Frederick H. Buttel, "The Political Economy of Class Structure in U.S. Agriculture: A Theoretical Outline," in *The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies: Critical Perspectives*, ed. Frederick H. Buttel and Howard Newby (Montclair, NJ: Allanheld Osmun, 1980). This argument does not imply that farmers never exploit labour. They did so in the period under consideration when they employed "hired men" or threshing gangs. But the theoretical point is that wage labour and the extraction of surplus value were not central to the farm enterprise. On seasonal labour in threshing see Thomas Isern, *Bull Threshers and Bindlestiffs: Harvesting and Threshing on the North American Plains* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1990).

25. Sarah Whatmore, *Farming Women: Gender, Work and Family Enterprise* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1990); Goodman and Redclift, *Refashioning Nature*, chapter 1.

26. Perry Anderson, *Considerations on Western Marxism* (London: NLB, 1976); Perry Anderson, *In the Tracks of Historical Materialism* (London: Verso, 1983); for the "debate" at its height see E.P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory* (London: Merlin, 1978); Perry Anderson, *Arguments Within English Marxism* (London: Verso, 1980) and Seccombe, "The Reproduction of Labour Power," 60-63.

27. Lazonick, "Class Relations in the Capitalist Enterprise."

28. See Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London: Verso, 1991) for a recent survey.

29. Class and gender ideologies intersect with other ideologies (racial, religious, ethnic, regional, national and so forth) in a given society, but the overall ideological ensemble is patterned by gender and class. In Althusserian terminology, gender and class are overdetermining. See Goran Therborn, *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology* (London: Verso, 1980), especially 71-72. In the rest of the text, the term ideology shall mean class and gender ideology.

    In order to save historians from having to read too much theory, it is not possible to defend here the propositions made in this paragraph. Part of the defence is in Jettery M. Taylor, "Dominant and Popular Ideologies in the Making of Rural Manitobans, 1890-1925" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manitoba, 1988), 26-48.

30. Recent noteworthy additions to the voluminous literature on Antonio Gramsci include Esteve Morera, *Gramsci's Historicism: A Realist Interpretation* (London: Routledge, 1990) and Renate Holub, *Antonio Gramsci: Beyond Marxism and Postmodernism* (London: Routledge, 1992).

31. Helpful guides have been Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Feminism Without Illusions: A Critique of Individualism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991); Michelle Barrett, *Women's Oppression Today* (London: Verso, 1988); Joan Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990); Denise Riley, *Am I That Name? Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History* (London: Macmillan, 1988).

32. A recent addition to the culturalist canon is E.P. Thompson, *Customs in Common* (London: Merlin Press, 1992). The classic culturalist text in North American agrarian historiography is Lawrence Goodwyn, *Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978). A recent defence, in the form of a polemic against poststructuralist incursions into the field of social history, is Bryan D. Palmer, *Descent into Discourse: The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990). Helpful feminist historical writing includes Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "Socialist-Feminist American Women's History: A Review Essay," *Journal of Women's History* 1, no. 3 (Winter 1990); Linda Gordon, *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence* (New York: Penguin, 1988); Stephanie Coontz, *The Social Origins of Private Life: A History of American Families, 1600-1900* (London: Verso, 1988); Mariana Valverde, *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1991); and Franca Iacovetta and Mariana Valverde, eds., *Gender Conflicts: New Essays in Women's History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992).

33. Louis Althusser, *For Marx* (London: NLB, 1977); Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (London: Verso, 1985); Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of History (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); Patrick Joyce, *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class, 1848-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Pauline Rosenau, *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

34. My understanding of the state and education has been formed by: Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971); Ralph Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969), especially chapter 8; Ralph Miliband, *Marxism and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), chapters 3 and 4; Leo Panitch, *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977); Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," in Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy* (London: NLB, 1971); Stuart Hall, "Schooling, State and Society," in Roger Dale et al., eds., *Education and the State, Volume I: Schooling and the National Interest* (Lewes, England: Falmer Press, 1981); Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (London: Sage Publications, 1977); Barrett, *Women's Oppression Today*, chapters 4 and 7; AnnMarie Wolpe, "The Official Ideology of Education for Girls," in Roger Dale et al., eds., *Education and the State, Volume II: Politics, Patriarchy and Practice* (Lewes, England: Falmer Press, 1981); Education Group II (University of Birmingham, Department of Cultural Studies), *Education Limited: Schooling and Training and the New Right Since 1979* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1991); Andy Green, *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the USA* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990).

35. On theoretical and practical ideology see Althusser, *For Marx*, 231; Dominique Lecourt, "On Archaelogy and Knowledge," in Dominique Lecourt, *Marxism and Epistemology* (London: NLB, 1975), 208-13; Simon Dentith, "Political Economy, Fiction and the Language of Practical Ideology in Nineteenth Century England," *Social History* 8, no. 2 (May 1983).

36. This is what Althusser calls a problematic: "the objective internal reference system of ... [a theory's] particular themes, the system of questions commanding the answers given." Althusser, *For Marx*, 67n.

37. See Therborn, *The Ideology of Power*, especially 81-84.

38. See, for example, Ernesto Laclau, "Towards a Theory of Populism," in Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory* (London: NLB, 1979) and Ernesto Laclau, "Populist Rupture and Discourse," *Screen Education* 34 (Spring 1980).

39. Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism," 107.

40. On the appropriation and transformation of language see, for example, Robert Gray, "The Deconstructing of the English Working Class," *Social History* 11, no. 3 (October 1986); Patrick Joyce, "The Historical Meanings of Work: An Introduction" and Robert Gray, "The Languages of Factory Reform in Britain, c. 1830-1880," in *The Historical Meanings of Work*, ed. Patrick Joyce (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Roy Porter and Peter Burke, eds, *The Social History of Language*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Roy Porter and Peter Burke, eds, *The Social History of Language*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Gabrielle M. Spiegel, "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 65, no. 1 (January 1990). For an example of how feminists appropriated the language of radicalism in early-nineteenth-century England see Barbara Taylor, *Eve and the New Jerusalem* (London: Virago, 1983), especially chapter 4.

41. Susan Houston, "The Impetus to Reform: Urban Crime, Poverty, and Ignorance in Ontario, 1850-1875" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1974); Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1977); Michael Katz, Michael Doucet and Mark Stern, *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), chapter 9; Bruce Curtis, *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871* (London, Ont.: Althouse; Sussex: Falmer, 1988); Bruce Curtis, *True Government By Choice Men? Inspection, Education, and State Formation in Canada West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Susan Houston and Alison

Prentice, *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988); Marta Danylewycz, Beth Light, and Alison Prentice, "The Evolution of the Sexual Division of Labour in Teaching: A Nineteenth Century Ontario and Quebec Case Study," *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 16, no. 30 (May 1983); R.D. Gidney and D.A. Lawr, "Community vs. Bureaucracy?: The Origins of Bureaucratic Procedure in the Upper Canadian School System," *Journal of Social History* 13, no. 3 (1980).

42. Burton Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: Norton, 1976), 288; Marta Danylewycz and Alison Prentice, "Teachers' Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Central Canada," *Labour/Le Travail* 17 (Spring 1986); Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), chapters 3 and 5; James Pitsula, "The Emergence of Social Work in Toronto," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 14, no. 1 (Spring 1979); Veronica Strong-Boag, "Intruders in the Nursery: Childcare Professionals Reshape the Years One to Five," in *Childhood and Family in Canadian History*, ed. Joy Parr (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982); Lawrence Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); Paul Axelrod, *Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics, and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), chapter 1; S.E.D. Shortt, *The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian Intellectuals and Their Convictions in an Age of Transition, 1890-1930* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), chapter 8; A.B. McKillop, "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto," in A.B. McKillop, *Contours of Canadian Thought* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987); Clyde W. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990); Lynne D. Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990).

43. Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1975); Thomas Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977); Owram, *The Government Generation*, 52-68, 121-25; R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), chapters 9 and 10; Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976), 79-84; Eugene Forsey, *A Life on the Fringe: The Memoirs of Eugene Forsey* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990), 28-34.

44. David Noble, *America By Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism* (New York: Knopf, 1977).

45. Edward Danforth Eddy, *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education* (New York: Harper, 1957); Alfred Charles True, *A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-1925* (Washington: Arno Press, 1929); William C. Hunter, *Beacon Across the Prairie: North Dakota's Land Grant College* (Fargo: North Dakota State University Press, 1961); Douglas Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education in Ontario, 1870-1910" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972), chapter 3; Thomas Nesmith, "The Philosophy of Agriculture: The Promise of the Intellect in Ontario Farming, 1835-1914" (Ph.D. dissertation, Carleton University, 1988); John Ferguson Snell, *Macdonald College of McGill University: A History from 1904 to 1955* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1963); Arthur S. Morton, *Saskatchewan: The Making of a University* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959), chapter 9; Michael Hayden, *Seeking a Balance: The University of Saskatchewan, 1907-1982* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1983); Walter H. Johns, *A History of the University of Alberta, 1908-1969* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1981); David Jones, "Agriculture, the Land, and Education: British Columbia, 1914-1929" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978), 45-46; Margaret Rossiter, "The Organization of the Agricultural Sciences," in *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920*, ed. Alexandra Oleson and John Voss (Baltimore: John

Hopkins University Press, 1979); Deborah Kay Fitzgerald, *The Business of Breeding: Hybrid Corn in Illinois, 1890-1940* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990). Six new Canadian colleges, including the privately funded Macdonald College at McGill University, were formed between 1905 and 1915.

46. Roy Scott, *Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970), especially chapter 6; Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," 32-45, 50-60; David Danbom, *"Our Purpose is to Serve": The First Century of the North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station* (Fargo: North Dakota Institute for Regional Studies, 1990).

47. Gareth Stedman Jones, "Rethinking Chartism," in Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Patricia Hollis, *The Pauper Press: A Study in Working Class Radicalism of the 1830s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970); Edward Pessen, *Most Uncommon Jacksonians: The Radical Leaders of the Early Labor Movement* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1967), chapter 10; Alan Dawley, *Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976), especially chapters 2 and 8; Stanley Ryerson, *Unequal Union: Confederation and the Roots of Conflict in the Canadas, 1815-1873* (Toronto: Progress Publishers, 1975), 85-133; David Montgomery, "Labor and the Republic in Industrial America: 1860-1920," *Mouvement social* 111 (avril/juin 1980); David Montgomery, *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1867-1872* (New York: Knopf, 1967); Gerald Grob, *Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement, 1865-1900* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), chapter 2; Chester Destler, "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901: Concepts and Origins," in Chester Destler, *American Radicalism, 1865-1901* (1946; New York: Octagon Books, 1965); Sean Wilentz, "Against Exceptionalism: Class Consciousness and the American Labor Movement, 1790-1920," *International Labor and Working Class History* 26 (Fall 1984); Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); Russell Hann, *Farmers Confront Industrialism: Some Historical Perspectives on Ontario Agrarian Movements* (Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1975); Louis Aubrey Wood, *A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada: The Origins and Development of Agrarian Protest, 1872-1924* (1924; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), part 1.

48. On the Knights of Labor, see Grob, *Workers and Utopia*, chapter 3; Melvyn Dubofsky, *Industrialism and the American Worker, 1865-1920* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1975), 54-61; Kealey and Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be*; Leon Fink, *Workingmen's Democracy: The Knights of Labor and American Politics* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1983), chapter 1; Russell Hann, "Brainworkers and the Knights of Labor: E.E. Sheppard, Phillips Thompson, and the *Toronto News*, 1883-1887," in *Essays in Canadian Working Class History*, ed. Gregory S. Kealey and Peter Warrian (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976). The Knights, while they may have represented the North American working class fully "made" as culturalist historiography suggests, employed a language which predated proletarianization and, more importantly, extended beyond the world of the waged worker.

    On agrarianism, see Bruce Palmer, *Man Over Money: The Southern Populist Critique of American Capitalism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980); Goodwyn, *Democratic Promise*; Destler, "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901"; Norman Pollack, ed., *The Populist Mind* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967); Norman Pollack, *The Populist Response to Industrial America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962); Ramsay Cook, "Tillers and Toilers: The Rise and Fall of Populism in Canada in the 1890s," Canadian Historical Association *Reports* (1984); S.E.D. Shortt, "Social Change and Political Crisis in Rural Ontario: the Patrons of Industry, 18891896," in *Oliver Mowat's Ontario*, ed. Donald Swainson (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1972).

49. Palmer, *Working Class Experience*, chapter 4; Craig Heron, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," *Labour/Le Travail* 13 (Spring 1984); Gerald A. Friesen, "'Yours in Revolt': Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement," *Labour/Le Travailleur* 1 (1976); James Naylor, *The New Democracy: Challenging the Social Order in Industrial Ontario, 1914-25* (Toronto: University of

Toronto Press, 1991); A. Ross McCormack, *Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977); Norman Penner, *The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis* (Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1977), chapter 3.

50. Theodore Saloutos and John Hicks, *Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West, 1900-1939* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951); Gilbert Fite, *American Farmers: The New Minority* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1981); W.L. Morton, *The Progressive Party in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950); Harald S. Patton, *Grain Growers' Cooperation in Western Canada* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928); Ian MacPherson, *Each for All: A History of the Cooperative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979), 9-16, 77-80; John Thompson with Allan Seager, *Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985), 28-37; David Laycock, *Populism and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), chapter 2; Gerald Panting, "A Study of the United Farmers' of Manitoba to 1928: An Agricultural Association During a Period of Transition" (Master's thesis, University of Manitoba, 1954).

51. James Green, *Grass-Roots Socialism: Radical Movements in the Southwest, 1895-1943* (Baton Rouge: University of Louisiana Press, 1978); Garin Burbank, *When Farmers Voted Red* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1976); Robert Morlan, *Political Prairie Fire: The Nonpartisan League, 1915-22* (1955; St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1985); James Putman, "The Socialist Party of North Dakota, 1902-1918" (Master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1956); Lowell K. Dyson, *Red Harvest: The Communist Party and American Farmers* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982); D.S. Spafford, "The Left-Wing, 1921-1931," in *Politics in Saskatchewan*, ed. Norman Ward and D.S. Spafford (Toronto: Longmans, 1968); D.S. Spafford, "The Origin of the Farmers' Union of Canada," in *Historical Essays on the Prairie Provinces*, ed. Donald Swainson (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970); David Monod, "Rethinking Prairie Communism," *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 18, no. 35 (May 1985); Macpherson, *Each for All*, 68-77; Thompson with Seager, *Canada 1922-1939*, 229-35; Seymour Martin Lipset, *Agrarian Socialism: The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan: A Study in Political Sociology* (1950; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971); Alvin Finkel, *The Social Credit Phenomenon in Alberta* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989); Laycock, *Populism and Democratic Thought*, chapters 3 and 4. This analysis runs counter to the tradition that sees western Canadian agrarianism as a populist "expression" of petit-bourgeois experience. See, for example, Peter Sinclair, "Class Structure and Populist Protest: The Case of Western Canada," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1975); J.F. Conway, "Populism in the United States, Russia, and Canada: Explaining the Roots of Canada's Third Parties," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 11, no. 1 (1978); J.F. Conway, "The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy: Some Reconsiderations," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1979); and John Richards and Larry Pratt, *Prairie Capitalism: Power and Influence in the New West* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979), 20-38. Laycock, meanwhile, seeks to avoid the problem of class reductionism by abandoning materialism to embrace discourse theory. He isolates four systems of populist thought which seem to operate at their own distinct level, unencumbered by interactions with other discursive systems or material determinations.

52. Mari Jo Buhle, *Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981), 53-90; Wendy Mitchinson, "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study of Nineteenth Century Feminism," in *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada, 1880s-1920s*, ed. Linda Kealey (Toronto: The Women's Press, 1979), 151-67; Nancy Sheehan, "The WCTU and Educational Strategies on the Canadian Prairies," in *Schools in the West: Essays in Canadian Educational History*, ed. Nancy Sheehan and David Jones (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986); Graeme Decarie, "Something Old, Something New...: Aspects of Prohibitionism in Ontario in the 1890s," in Swainson, *Oliver Mowat's Ontario*, 167-71; Kealey and Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be*, 105-7, 356; Marilyn Brady, "Populism and Feminism in a

Newspaper by and for Women of the Kansas Farmers' Alliance," *Kansas History* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1984/85). For context see Judith Allen, "Contextualising Late-Nineteenth Century Feminism: Problems and Comparisons," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* (1990): 17-36.

53. Carol Lee Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?: The Ideas of the English Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983); for a critical review of Bacchi see Ernest Forbes, "A Review Article on Carol Lee Bacchi's *Liberation Deferred?: The Ideas of the English Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918*," *Atlantis* 10, no. 2 (Spring 1985); Wayne Roberts, "'Rocking the Cradle for the World': The New Woman and Maternal Feminism, Toronto 1877-1914," in Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*; Ramsay Cook, "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism," in *The West and the Nation: Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton*, ed. Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976); Deborah Gorham, "Flora McDonald Denison: Canadian Feminist," in Kealey, *A Not Unreasonable Claim*; Veronica Strong-Boag, "Ever a Crusader: Nellie McClung: First Wave Feminist," in *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*, ed. Veronica Strong-Boag and Anita Fellman (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1986); Mary Kinnear, *Margaret McWilliams: An Interwar Feminist* (Montreal / Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991).

54. Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, 118-23; Linda Kealey, "Canadian Socialism and the Woman Question, 1900-1914," *Labour/Le Travail* 13 (Spring 1984); Linda Kealey, "Women in the Canadian Socialist Movement, 1904-1914," in *Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics*, ed. Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989); Patricia Roome, "Amelia Turner and Calgary Labour Women, 1919-1935," in Kealey and Sangster, *Beyond the Vote*; Alice Klein and Wayne Roberts, "Besieged Innocence: The 'Problem' and Problems of Working Women — Toronto, 1896-1914," in *Women at Work, 1850-1930*, ed. Janice Acton, Penny Goldsmith, and Bonnie Shepard (Toronto: Women's Press, 1974); Joan Sangster, *Dreams of Equality: Women on the Canadian Left, 1920-1950* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989), chapters 1 and 2; Janice Newton, "The Alchemy of Politicization: Socialist Women and the Early Canadian Left," in Iacovetta and Valverde, *Gender Conflicts*.

55. Bacchi, *Liberation Deferred?*, 123-32; Margaret Kechnie, "The United Farm Women of Ontario: Developing a Political Consciousness," *Ontario History* 78, no. 4 (December 1985); June Menzies, "Votes for Saskatchewan Women," in Ward and Spafford, *Politics in Saskatchewan*; Sally Mahood, "The Women's Suffrage Movement in Canada and Saskatchewan," in *Women Unite! An Anthology of the Canadian Women's Movement*, ed. Janice Acton et al. (Toronto: Canadian Women's Educational Press, 1972); Veronica Strong-Boag, "Pulling in Double Harness or Hauling a Double Load: Women, Work and Feminism on the Canadian Prairie," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 21, no. 3 (Fall 1986); Catherine Cavanaugh, "The Limitations of the Pioneering Partnership: The Alberta Campaign for Homestead Dower, 1909-25," *Canadian Historical Review* 74, no. 2 (June 1993); Alvin Finkel, "Populism and Gender: The UFA and Social Credit Experiences," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27, no. 4 (Winter 1992/93); G. Beito, "'I am a Farmer's Wife, not a Farmerette': Letters to the Nonpartisan Leader, 1917-1920," in *Plainswoman: An Anthology of Rural Women, March 1981-April 1983* (Grand Forks: University of North Dakota Press, 1983); Sally Miller, "Kate Richards O'Hare: Progression toward Feminism," *Kansas History* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1984/85).

Chapter 3

1. Vernon C. Fowke, *Canadian Agricultural Policy: The Historical Pattern* (1946; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 156; Douglas Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education in Ontario, 1870-1910" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972), chapter 2; *Statutes of Canada*, 31 Vic., ch. 53, 1868; *Canada Agriculture: The First One Hundred Years* (Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services, 1967), part 1; T.H. Anstey, *One Hundred Harvests: Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, 1886-1986* (Ottawa: The Branch, 1986), chapter 1.

2. Fowke, *Canadian Agricultural Policy*, chapter 9; Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," chapter 2; *Statutes of Canada*, 49 Vic., ch. 57, 1886.

3. Fowke, *Canadian Agricultural Policy*, 246-47; Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," 73-74; Neil Sutherland, *Children in English Canadian Society, 1880-1920* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 188, 198-99; Robert Stamp, "Vocational Objectives in Canadian Education: An Historical Overview," in *Canadian Higher Education in the Seventies*, ed. Sylvia Ostry (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972), 247-52; David Jones, "Agriculture, the Land, and Education: British Columbia, 1914-1929" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978), 24; Fowke, *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy*, 162-64; R.C Brown and Ramsay Cook, *Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974), 195-96.
4. John H. Ellis, *The Ministry of Agriculture in Manitoba, 1870-1970* (Winnipeg: Department of Agriculture, 1970), 41-46, 66; *Statutes of Manitoba* (*SM*), 35 Vic., ch. 15, 1872. Contrast this policy with the simultaneous use of federal government farm instructors to teach Natives to be peasants: Sarah Carter, *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990).
5. *SM*, 53 Vic., ch. 35, 1890; *SM*, 63-64 Vic., ch. 2, 1900.
6. W.L. Morton, *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), 57-60, 85-88, 117-18, 132-37; Ellis, *The Ministry of Agriculture*, 181-86; *SM*, 3 Ed. 6, ch. 1, 1904; *SM*, 2 Geo. V, ch. 1, 1912; *SM*, 6 Geo. V, ch. 1, 1916; *SM*, 14 Geo. V, ch. 71, 1924.
7. Ellis, *Ministry of Agriculture*, 196-98.
8. "Report of the Agricultural College Commission," *Manitoba Sessional Papers* (*MSP*), no. 17 (1903).
9. Rutherford in agriculture, F. Torrance in veterinary science, F.W. Broderick in horticulture and forestry, G.A. Sproule in English and mathematics, and A.R. Greig in engineering and mechanics. "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," *MSP*, no. 14 (1905), 410-11; *MSP*, no. 16 (1906).
10. *MSP*, no. 18 (1907), 519-20; *MSP*, no. 11 (1908), 516-17; *MSP*, no. 8 (1909), 605-6.
11. University of Manitoba Archives (UMA), Manitoba Agricultural College (MAC) Papers, "Board of Directors," 11 October 1910.
12. UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 19 February 1919.
13. Ibid., "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," *MSP*, no. 14 (1905).
14. Ibid., "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," *MSP*, no. 19 (1914).
15. Ibid., "Report of the MAC Board of Directors," *MSP*, no. 14 (1916).
16. Ibid., "Board of Directors," 20 September 1918; ibid., "Advisory Council," 11 November 1924.
17. *MAC Gazette* 6, no. 5 (March 1913) and 7, no. 1 (October 1913). See the letter from Rebecca Dayton, President, Home Economics Societies, to Valentine Winkler in which Black is described as patronizing and overbearing towards women in his role as Director of Home Economics Societies. Provincial Archives of Manitoba (PAM), Valentine Winkler Papers, box 1, 16 September 1915.
18. Alonzo James Madill, *History of Agricultural Education in Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1937), 172-73; John Kendle, *John Bracken: A Political Biography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), chapter 2; Ellis, *Ministry of Agriculture*, 188, 633; UMA, MAC Papers, "Staff Minutes," 24 November 1911; ibid., "Board of Directors," 29 September 1915, 1 June 1920. On other North American agricultural colleges see Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," chapter 3; William C. Hunter, *Beacon Across the Prairie: North Dakota's Land Grant College* (Fargo: North Dakota State University Press, 1961); Stanley M. Murray, "James Power: The Second President of North Dakota Agricultural College," *North Dakota Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (Autumn 1974); Edward Danforth Eddy, *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education* (New York: Harper, 1957).
19. *The Farmers' Advocate*, 10 May 1905, 687; UMA, MAC Papers, "Staff Minutes," 11 February 1911; ibid., "Board of Directors," 22 December 1909, 15 February 1911.
20. "MAC President's Report, 1915," *MSP*, no. 14 (1916).
21. UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 24 January 1924, 28 March 1924; ibid., "Advisory Council," 11 November 1924, 21 January 1925, 11 November 1925.

22. *Managra* and *MAC Gazette*, 1905-24. The amount of information available on each individual varies. I know the geographic origin and initial academic rank of fifty-nine (43 percent), the educational background of seventy-four (54 percent), and the previous employment of seventy-one (51 percent) of the faculty members.
23. As I noted in footnote 22, I know the geographic origin of only fifty-nine, or 43 percent, of the MAC faculty.
24. Unfortunately, most of the information on geographic origin is no more specific than province or state. Of the seventeen Ontarians for whom more specific information is available, only six were raised on a farm while eleven were from cities. Similarly, of the twelve Manitobans for whom specific information is available, eight were from towns and only four came from farms.
25. As I noted in footnote 22, I have educational information on seventy-four, or 54 percent, of the MAC faculty.
26. As I noted in footnote 22, I have previous employment information on seventy-one, or 51 percent, of MAC faculty.
27. UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 16 February 1909.
28. Ibid., "Board of Directors," 11 January 1912.
29. Ibid., "Board of Directors," 22 March 1916.
30. "MAC Report for 1919: The President," *MSP* (1920), 3.
31. UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 8 October 1919.
32. Ibid., "Board of Directors," 13 January 1920. All sixty-one people employed in MAC in 1919-20 received a pay raise under the new schedule. For example, the president's salary went from $4,000 to $4,500; his secretary's salary went from $1,020 to $1,140; a professor in field husbandry, $3,000 to $3,300; an assistant professor in animal husbandry, $1,900 to $2,400; a lecturer in dairying, $1,800 to $2,000; a demonstrator in biology, $900 to $1,200; the director of home economics, $2,000 to $2,300; a professor in home economics, $1,800 to $1,900; a lecturer in home economics, $1,600 to $1,700; an instructor in home economics, $1,200 to $1,400; and the telephone operator, $780 to $960.
33. UMA, MAC Papers, "Advisory Council," 11 November 1925.
34. Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), 202-4; Emma Seifrit Wrigley, "It Might Have Been Euthenics: The Lake Placid Conferences and the Home Economics Movement," *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 79-96; William D. Jenkins, "Housewifery and Motherhood: The Question of Role Change in the Progressive Era," in *Woman's Being, Woman's Place: Female Identity and Vocation in American History*, ed. Mary Kelley (Boston: Hall, 1979), 146-48; Edith Child Rowles, *Home Economics in Canada: The Early History of Six College Programmes* (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan, 1966), chapters 1 and 2.
35. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendars, 1911-1912, 1914-1915, 1915-1916, 1920-1921; for an overview of home economics education in Manitoba see Johanna Gudrun Wilson, *A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba, 1826-1966* (Winnipeg: n.p., 1969); see also Rowles, *Home Economics in Canada* for the experience at other Canadian colleges.
36. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1911-1912, "Outline of Courses: Household Science"; ibid., MAC Calendar, 1915-1916, 86-96; "MAC Report: Report of Household Science Department, Report of Household Art Department," *MSP*, no. 11 (1917).
37. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1919-1920, 47-56; ibid., MAC Calendar, 1925-1926, 60-65.
38. Staff announcements in *Managra* 1910, 1912, 1915, 1918, 1922; Ellis, *Ministry of Agriculture*, 634; PAM, Manitoba Women's Institute (MWI) Papers, box 13, "Early Institute History" File, Letter from A.B. Juniper to Esther Thompson, 5 February, 1925; UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 13 January, 1920; UMA, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory, box 4, "MAC Report to Education Commission, Teaching Staff" and "Home Economics Report" in "MAC Annual Report," 1926-27; PAM, Manitoba Home Economics Association Papers, box 1, "Minute Books," 11 March 1911, 13 May 1911, April 1912, 18 May 1912, 9 October 1915; Wilson, *History of Home Economics*, 178.

39. George F. Warren, *Farm Management* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1911).

40. Thomas Nixon Carver, *Principles of Rural Economics* (Boston: Ginn, 1911); Henry C. Taylor, *An Introduction to the Study of Agricultural Economics* (New York: Macmillan, 1905).

41. Henry C. Taylor and Anne Taylor, *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932* (Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1952); G.F. Warren, "The Origin and Development of Farm Economics in the United States," *Journal of Farm Economics* 14, no. 1 (January 1932); Harry C. McDean, "Professionalism in the Rural Social Sciences, 1896-1919," *Agricultural History* 58, no. 3 (1984); C.L. Holmes, "Farm Management," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 6 (New York: Macmillan, 1931), 111-14; E.G. Nourse, "Agricultural Economics," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 1, 534-36. Agricultural economics was part of a continental history during this period. At the University of Manitoba political economy was taught as early as 1882 and, in 1909, A.B. Clark was appointed the first university professor of political economy. When the Canadian Political Science Association was formed in 1913 political economy, encompassing all of social science and characterized by an historical approach, became institutionally established as an area of enquiry. It was not until the 1930s and 1940s, however, with the influence of Keynesianism and neoclassicism, that Canadian economics emerged as a distinct discipline. Craufurd D.W. Goodwin, *Canadian Economic Thought: The Political Economy of a Developing Nation, 1814-1914* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1961); Doug Owram, *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986).

42. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendars, 1907-1925.

43. Ibid., Examination Papers, 1908-1910; "MAC Annual Report, 1916," *MSP*, no. 11 (1917), 634; *Comprehensive Dissertation Index* 33, 1861-1972 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973), 336; UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 2 April 1918.

44. Commission on Country Life, *Report of the Commission on Country Life* (New York: n.p., 1911); Canada. Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education. *Report* (1913-14); Canada. Commission of Conservation. *Reports* (1911-17).

45. John Gillette, *Constructive Rural Sociology* (New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1913); John MacDougall, *Rural Life in Canada: Its Trends and Tasks* (Toronto: Westminister, 1913).

46. This discussion of rural sociology is based upon Lowry Nelson, *Rural Sociology: Its Origin and Growth in the United States* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969); Lowry Nelson, "The Rise of Rural Sociology: The Pre-Purnell Period," *Rural Sociology* 30, no. 4 (December 1965); Lowry Nelson, "Constructing Rural Sociology," *Rural Sociology* 9, no. 3 (September 1944); Edmund deS. Brunner, *The Growth of a Science: A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States* (New York: Harper, 1957); Otis Durant Duncan, "Rural Sociology Coming of Age," *Rural Sociology* 19, no. 1 (March 1954); and Frederick H. Buttel, Olaf F. Larson, and Gilbert W. Gillespie, Jr., *The Sociology of Agriculture* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), chapter 1. Rural sociology in Manitoba during this period was, like agricultural economics, part of a continental history. Canadian sociology did not emerge as a distinct discipline until much later. Although sociology courses were taught in various Canadian universities as early as 1915 and McGill established a sociology department between 1923 and 1925, social analysis in Canada was generally viewed as being the purview of political economy. At the University of Toronto, for example, sociology remained within the Department of Political Economy until 1963. Harry Hiller, *Society and Change: S.D. Clark and the Development of Canadian Sociology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982) and Marlene Shore, *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origin of Social Research in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).

47. *MAC Gazette* 9, no. 3 (January 1916): 32; UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendars, 1913-25.

48. *MAC Gazette* (November 1915); "Report of Rural Sociology and Rural Economics, Manitoba Agricultural College," *MSP*, no. 11 (1917), 705; UMA, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory, box 3, "Rural Sociology File: Department of Economics and Sociology Special Report on Research, 21 September 1927"; *Comprehensive Dissertation Index* 36, 1861-1972 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973), 213; Robert W. Murchie,

Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1936); Nelson, *Rural Sociology*, 70 (incidentally, Nelson succeeded Murchie at Minnesota following the latter's death in 1937). Murchie's career suggests that he had a North American rather than a Canadian orientation.

49. *The Farmers' Advocate* (*TFA*), 20 July 1893, 263; 5 August 1984, 301; 5 August 1895, 301; 20 November 1896, 450; 5 August 1896, 300; 5 April 1897, 148; *MSP*, no. 26 (1895).

50. *TFA*, 20 October 1894, 410; 5 March 1895, 89; 5 April 1895, 139; 5 December 1895, 465; *MSP*, no. 20 (1897); *MSP*, no. 11 (1900).

51. *TFA*, 5 November 1897, 478; 5 January 1900, 14; *MSP*, no. 11 (1900).

52. *TFA*, 5 January 1894, 3.

53. *TFA*, 20 November 1900, 638; 5 February 1902, 79; 1 March 1905, 298; *MSP*, no. 10 (1902).

54. "The Renaissance of Manitoba Farmers' Institutes is Approaching," *TFA*, 1 March 1905, 298; UMA, MAC Papers, "Department of Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work," MAC Calendar, 1908-09; ibid., "Department of College Extension Work," MAC Calendar, 1909-10; Ellis, *Ministry of Agriculture*, 200-201.

55. PAM, MWI Papers, box 13, "Early Institute History File"; ibid., box 14, "Particulars Re. Formation of Women's Institutes in Manitoba: Meeting Undertaken by Household Science, MAC 1910"; *MSP*, no. 2 (1911), 167-68; "Household Science Convention," *MAC Gazette* 1, no. 7 (March 1911): 67; Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, *History of Manitoba Agricultural Extension Staff, 1913-70* (Winnipeg: Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, 1974), 22.

56. *MSP*, no. 23 (1911), 169; UMA, MAC Papers, "Staff Minutes, 1 December 1911, 4 May 1912"; *MSP*, no. 8 (1912), 170-71; UMA, MAC Papers, "Faculty Minutes," 9 April 1914; ibid., "College Extension," MAC Calendar, 1913-14.

57. Ellis, *Ministry of Agriculture*, 225-26.

58. Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, *History of Manitoba Agricultural Extension Staff*, 10-11, 16-19; "The Appointment of Field Representatives," *MAC Gazette* 8, no. 1 (November 1914); "The District Representative," *MAC Gazette* 9, no. 1 (November 1915): 8-11; "What the Agricultural Representatives Are Doing," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 1, no. 2 (December 1920); *MSP*, no. 11 (1917), 719-20; Manitoba Department of Agriculture (MDA), *Annual Reports* 1921-22, 1922-23, 1923-24; Ellis, *Ministry of Agriculture*, 224-25.

59. UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 14 December 1916, 5 April 1917, 26 November 1917, 2 April 1918; Esther Thompson, "Community Work," *Managra* 10, no. 2 (December 1917): 18; MDA, *Annual Report* (1921); "Annual Report of Manitoba Women's Institutes, 1923," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 3, no. 7 (July/August, 1923): 6; Wilson, *Home Economics Education*, 175-76.

60. "Sending the College to the Country," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 8 (1916); MDA, *Annual Report* 1921, 79-80, 101-5; "Report of the Publications Branch," *MSP*, no. 14 (1916); "Report of the Agricultural Publications Branch," MDA, *Annual Report* (1919).

61. Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York: Knopf, 1961), 75-85; Sutherland, *Children in English Canadian Society*, chapter 12; Lawr, "Development of Agricultural Education," 212; Liberty Hyde Bailey, *The Nature Study Idea* (New York: Macmillan, 1903); Liberty Hyde Bailey, *The Outlook of Nature* (New York: Macmillan, 1905); Albert H. Leake, *The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1915); James Collins Miller, *Rural Schools in Canada: Their Organization, Administration and Supervision* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913); Ellwood Patterson Cubberly, *Rural Life and Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914); H.W. Foght, *The American Rural School* (New York: Macmillan, 1910).

62. "Teaching Agriculture," *TFA*, 20 June 1894, 246; *TFA*, 5 January 1895, 2; various inspector's reports between 1896 and 1905, for example, Manitoba Department of Education (MDE), *Annual Report* (1899), 42-43; *Annual Report* (1902), 523; *Annual Report* (1903), 581, 585, 587, 595; *Annual Report* (1904), 43-45; *Annual Report* (1905), 33.

63. MDE, *Annual Report* (1905), 49; *Annual Report* (1908), 475; *Annual Report* (1909), 54, 58, 94, 98, 109-10; *Annual Report* (1910), 53-54, 69-71, 121-22; *Annual Report* (1913), 116;

"Consolidation of Schools," MDE, *Annual Report* 1909, 121-28; Keith Wilson, "The Development of Education in Manitoba" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967), 316; Sutherland, *Children in English Canadian Society*, 195.

64. MDE, *Annual Report* (1908), 489-99; *Annual Report* (1914), 59, 148; *Annual Report* (1916), 197; *Annual Report* (1923-24), 81-83; "Report of the Royal Commission to Enquire Into and Report Upon the University," *MSP*, no. 9 (1910), 483; UMA, MAC Papers, "Staff Minutes," 1 December 1911; K.W. Gordon, "Agricultural Education in Manitoba High Schools," *MAC Gazette* 7, no. 4 (January 1914): 224.
65. MDE, *Annual Report* (1920-21), 148; Mary Speechly, "Science Puts on an Apron," *Grain Growers' Guide* 14 February 1923, 185; Wilson, *History of Home Economics Education*, chapter 7. See Wilson, *History of Home Economics*, chapter 2; Robert Stamp, "Teaching Girls Their 'God Given Place in Life': The Introduction of Home Economics in the Schools," *Atlantis* 2, no. 2, part 1 (Spring 1977); and Terry Crowley, "Madonnas before Magdalenes: Adelaide Hoodless and the Making of the Canadian Gibson Girl," *Canadian Historical Review* 67, no. 4 (December 1986) for eastern Canadian background on home economics education.
66. MDE, *Annual Report* (1913), 13; UMA, MAC Papers, "Board of Directors," 17 Februrary 1909; ibid., "Course in Agriculture for Teachers," MAC Calendar, 1909-10, 56, "Teachers' Short Course," MAC Calendar, 1912-13, 92; ibid., "Normal Teachers' Course," MAC Calendar, 1925-26.
67. Franklin M. Reck, *The 4-H Story: A History of 4-H Club Work* (Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1951), chapter 2; Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 79.
68. PAM, 4-H Papers, box 4, "Boys' and Girls' Clubs," 5 June 1913 manuscript.
69. Ibid., box 4, "Letter to G. Ross, Reeve of Roland Municipality from E.W. Jones, Extension Secretary, MAC," 23 April 1913 and "Handbook of Manitoba Boys' and Girls' Clubs, 1918-1919"; E.W. Jones, "Extension Section," *MAC Gazette* 7, no. 2 (November 1913): 90.
70. "Boys' and Girls' Clubs," MDE, *Annual Report* (1920-21); "Boys' and Girls' Clubs" and "Report of the Director of Technical Education of Manitoba," MDE, *Annual Report* (1923-24); "MAC Report: Extension Service," *MSP*, no. 11 (1917), 716-17.
71. "Boys' and Girls' Clubs," MDE , *Annual Report* (1921), 137; *Annual Report* (1917), 248; *Annual Report* (1922-23), 119; *Annual Report* (1924-25), 25-26. On the origin of the demonstration method in agricultural education, see Scott, *Reluctant Farmer*, chapters 8 and 9.

Chapter 4

1. This account is based upon Roll of Ipsden, Eric Roll, Baron, *A History of Economic Thought*, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1956), chapters 7, 8, and 9; J. Dorfman, "The Role of the German Historical School in American Economic Thought," *American Economic Review (Papers and Proceedings)* 45, no. 2 (May 1955); John Bates Clark, *The Distribution of Wealth* (New York: A.M. Kelley and Millman, 1924), "Preface" and "Table of Contents"; Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of Social Science, 1865-1905* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1975), *passim*; Goran Therborn, *Science, Class and Society* (London: NLB, 1976), chapter 2; Bob Rowthorn, "Neo-Classicism, Neo-Ricardianism and Marxism," *New Left Review* 86 (July/August 1974); Ben Fine, *Economic Theory and Ideology* (London: E. Arnold, 1980), chapter 7; Craufurd D.W. Goodwin, "Marginalism Moves to the New World," in *The Marginal Revolution in Economics*, ed. R.D. Colliston Black, A.W. Coats, and Craufurd D.W. Goodwin (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1973).
2. Richard Ely and George Ray Wicker, *Elementary Principles of Economics* (New York: Macmillan, 1904), 107.
3. Ibid., Part 1.
4. Ibid., Part 2.
5. Ibid., Part 3.

6. Ely made a point of distinguishing between income accruing to individuals and income accruing to the factors of production, arguing that the task of economics was to explain the latter. The fact that individual capitalists or individual workers receive particular incomes was the subject of considerations beyond economics, and therefore of little concern to the economist. Ibid., 356.
7. Ibid., 375.
8. Ibid., 433.
9. Henry C. Taylor, *Principles of Agricultural Economics* (New York: Macmillan, 1919), 31.
10. Thomas Nixon Carver, *Principles of Rural Economics* (Boston: Ginn, 1911), 290.
11. Taylor, *Principles*, chapter 3; Carver, *Principles*, 290-92.
12. In May 1926, Premier John Bracken asked R.W. Murchie to prepare "an inventory of the unused lands within the Province, with a view to developing a more effective programme for the settling of such of these lands as are suitable for agriculture." Bracken envisioned, and Murchie produced (with the assistance of Henry Grant and others), a survey of the acreage of unused lands, the suitability of the land for farming purposes, the location of different parcels of land, the types of farming best suited to the various districts, and the economic and social conditions in the respective areas. Bracken also asked that the report contain recommendations for "more economical production and more efficient marketing of farm products, as well as the further development of rural community life." In this chapter I analyze the economic and social sections of *Unused Lands of Manitoba* in order to illustrate how Manitoba rural social scientists employed the categories of their disciplines in their empirical studies. Provincial Archives of Manitoba (PAM), John Bracken Papers, box 130, file 1449, "Bracken to Murchie, 15 May 1926"; ibid., box 9, file 93, "Murchie to Bracken, 14 July 1926" and "Unoccupied Land Survey"; Robert W. Murchie and Henry C. Grant, *Unused Lands of Manitoba* (Winnipeg: Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Immigration, 1926).
13. Murchie and Grant, *Unused Lands of Manitoba*, 34.
14. Conrad H. Hammar, "Economic Recommendations," 23, in PAM, John Bracken Papers, box 130, file 1449. In his marginal notes to Hammar's manuscript, Murchie described this approach as betraying Hammar's American bias, perhaps because Hammar chose oranges as his example of an elastic commodity. It is probable that the sociologist Murchie actually mistrusted Hammar's economic bias. No doubt Henry Grant had less difficulty with the analysis.
15. Carver, *Principles*, 179.
16. Taylor's review of Carver, *Principles*, in *American Economic Review* 2, no. 3 (September 1912): 622.
17. Taylor, *Principles*, 153-54.
18. Taylor's review of Carver, *Principles*, 623-24.
19. Carver, *Principles*, 295; Taylor, *Principles*, chapter 10.
20. Taylor, *Principles*, 213, 244-45; Carver, *Principles*, 314, 296-301. "One special difficulty with the differential theory of rent ... is that the same piece of land is worth different sums to different men. ... [T]he same acre of land is worth a great deal more to a highly skilled scientific farmer than it is to a shiftless, unbusinesslike farmer." Carver, *Principles*, 300.
21. Henry Grant argued that a "management charge" should be included in farm expenses. Hence his definition of net farm profit was any income left after deducting from receipts all expenses (including management), interest on capital, an amount for unpaid family labour, and a return for the operator's labour. Profit, therefore, became a completely residual category bearing no direct relation to management or other factors of production. See UMA, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory, box 3, Henry C. Grant, "A Detailed Study of the Economic Factors Affecting the Productivity of Crops and Livestock in Thirty Manitoba Farms," 62; Warren, *Farm Management*, 15; Carver, *Principles*, 315; W.J. Spillman, "The Farmer's Income," and E.H. Thomson, "Profits

That Farmers Receive," in *Selected Readings in Rural Economics*, ed. Thomas Nixon Carver (New York: Ginn, 1916).

22. Grant, "A Detailed Study of the Economic Factors," 94.
23. Taylor, *Principles*, 488.
24. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "The Ideological Basis of Domestic Economy," in Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *The Fruits of Merchant Capital* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), chapter 11; Keith Tribe, *Land, Labour and Economic Discourse* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978), chapters 3 and 4.
25. Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon, 1982), chapter 10; Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973).
26. Therborn, *Science, Class and Society*, 99.
27. Philip Wicksteed, *Common Sense of Political Economy*, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1933), 159 — quoted in Therborn, *Science, Class and Society*, 110.
28. Christine Frederick, *The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Page, 1913), 225; see also Ellen Henrietta Richards, *The Cost of Living* (New York: Wiley, 1899); Ellen Henrietta Richards, *The Cost of Food* (New York: Wiley, 1901); Ellen Henrietta Richards, *The Cost of Shelter* (New York: Wiley, 1905).
29. Martha Foote Crow, *The American Country Girl* (1915; New York: Arno Press, 1974), 137, 222.
30. Foote Crow, *American Country Girl*, 214.
31. Christine Frederick, *Household Engineering: Scientific Management in the Home* (Chicago: American Home Economics Association, 1915), 282
32. Frederick, *Household Engineering*, 19-21, 96, 150-55, 176.
33. Frederick, *Household Engineering*, 65-69; Frederick, *New Housekeeping*, chapter 5.
34. Frederick, *New Housekeeping*, 103-4, 110-11; Richards, *Cost of Food*, 7-8; Frederick, *Household Engineering*, 319.
35. Foote Crow, *American Country Girl*, 223; Frederick, *New Housekeeping*, 118, 121, 123.
36. Foote Crow, *American Country Girl*, 224-26.
37. Frederick, *Household Engineering*, 505.
38. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity*, chapter 12.
39. Sidney Fine, *Laissez Faire and the General Welfare State* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964), chapter 8; Herman Schwendinger and Julie Schwendinger, *The Sociologists of the Chair* (New York: Basic Books, 1974); Anthony Oberschall, "The Institutionalization of American Sociology," in *The Establishment of Empirical Sociology*, ed. Anthony Obershall (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). The discipline of sociology, as Therborn has suggested, became committed to the strengthening of ideological cohesion: "the central sociological contribution to a scientific discourse on society (whatever its value) ... *has essentially consisted in the discovery and study of the ideological community* — i.e. community of values and norms — *in human aggregates of various types and sizes*. In the practical application of its theory, sociology has characteristically demanded a commitment to the strengthening of some such sort of ideological community. Originating as a successor to traditional political philosophy, sociology thus became in many ways a modern, sceintifically oriented equivalent to theology and moral philosophy — an investigatory rather than a dogmatic guardian of the ideological community." Therborn, *Science, Class and Society*, 224-25: emphasis in the original.
40. Charles A. Ellwood, *Sociology and Modern Social Problems* (New York: Appleton, 1910), chapter 4, 388-91.
41. Ellwood, *Sociology*, 397.
42. Ellwood, *Sociology*, 400, 406.
43. Ellwood, *Sociology*, 76.

44. John Gillette, *Constructive Rural Sociology* (New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1913), chapters 2 and 3.

45. The Turtle Mountain and Swan River surveys, conducted by the Social Service Council of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, were part of a larger program of church-sponsored social surveys of urban and rural areas. This social gospel commitment to the resolution of social problems was an example of the influence of sociological thinking among progressive church people. Here I analyze the surveys in order to illustrate how Murchie, as the main author of the surveys and a Manitoba rural social scientist, employed sociological categories in his empirical work. Richard Allen, *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), 12-13.

46. *Swan River: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life* (Winnipeg: Departments of Social Service and Evangelism of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, 1914); *Turtle Mountain: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life* (Winnipeg: Departments of Social Service and Evangelism of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, 1914); Murchie and Grant, *Unused Lands of Manitoba*, 46-59; Gillette, *Constructive Rural Sociology*, chapter 18, "The Rural Social Survey."

47. John Gillette, "Nature of the Rural Social Problem," *Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota* 2 (April 1912): 256.

48. Gillette, *Constructive Rural Sociology*, 185.

49. Gillette, *Constructive Rural Sociology*, 204 and chapters 13 and 14 generally.

50. *Turtle Mountain*, 24.

51. *Swan River*, 17.

52. Robert W. Murchie, "The Place of Play in the Country," *Grain Growers' Guide*, 9 May 1923, 597. For a general discussion of rational recreation in Canada during an earlier period, see Alan Metcalfe, *Canada Learns to Play: The Emergence of Organized Sport, 1807-1914* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987), especially chapters 4 and 5.

53. Murchie, "The Place of Play," 618.

54. Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York: Knopf, 1961), 101-5; R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture* (New York: Holt, 1953), 380-82; Carolyn Steedman, "'The Mother Made Conscious': The Historical Development of a Primary School Pedagogy," *History Workshop Journal* 20 (Autumn 1985); Joseph Kett, *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 217-21; Douglas Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education in Ontario, 1870-1910" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972), 207-21.

55. Butts and Cremin, *History of Education*, 382-86; Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 115-26.

56. Albert H. Leake, *The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1915), xv and "Table of Contents."

57. James Collins Miller, *Rural Schools in Canada: Their Organization, Administration and Supervision* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913).

58. The Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education was established by Wilfrid Laurier's government in 1910 to enquire into the "needs and present equipment of ... Canada respecting industrial training and technical education, and into the systems and methods of technical instruction obtaining in other countries." James Robertson, the chair of the commission, had been active in the new education movement for many years prior to his appointment, most notably in his activities with William Macdonald between 1899 and 1910. As Neil Sutherland has suggested, the report which Robertson and his colleagues wrote "was far more than a narrow study of industrial training and technical education. ... [I]ts comments and recommendations made the report into a blueprint for the implementation in Canada of the 'new' education." In this analysis, therefore, I treat the royal commission report as a significant and representative text in the new (and rural) educational movement and the new (and rural) educational discourse. Neil Sutherland, *Children in English*

Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth Century Consensus (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 198-201.

59. *Dominion of Canada Sessional Papers* (*CSP*), no. 191d (1913).
60. Leake, *Means and Methods*, xxii.
61. *CSP*, no. 191d (1913), 39-40.
62. Ibid., 43-44.
63. Miller, *Rural Schools in Canada*, chapter 9.
64. Leake, *Means and Methods*, 58, 84, 95, 82-83.

Chapter 5

1. *Grain Growers' Guide* (*Guide*), 10 March 1920, 546; Seager Wheeler, *Seager Wheeler's Book on Profitable Grain Growing* (Winnipeg: Grain Growers' Guide Limited, 1919); John Bracken, *Crop Production in Western Canada* (Winnipeg: Grain Growers' Guide Limited, 1920).
2. *The Farmers' Advocate* (*TFA*), 20 January 1893, 24; 20 December 1893, 1; 5 December 1895, 1.
3. *MAC Gazette* (February 1912): 13; *MSP*, no. 19 (1914), 667.
4. *Guide*, 18 February 1925, 196; *MAC Gazette* (March 1908): 42-43.
5. *TFA*, 20 July 1895, 274.
6. *TFA*, 20 June 1893, 223.
7. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1919-20, 34-35.
8. "Our Real Problems," *MAC Gazette* (December 1915): 45.
9. J. Orr, "Farming as a Specialist," *TFA*, 5 April 1893, 123; J. Elder, "The Institute Campaign," *TFA*, 1 January 1893, 9.
10. *MAC Gazette* (March 1913): 364.
11. Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, *History of Manitoba Agricultural Extension Staff, 1913-70* (Winnipeg: Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, 1974), 12-15; *MAC Gazette* (March 1913): 364.
12. "Plowing Matches," *TFA*, 20 June 1900, 326; "Annual Convention of Manitoba Agricultural Societies," *TFA*, 30 January 1907, 158-59; UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1913-14, "College Extension"; "Agricultural Fairs," Manitoba Department of Agriculture (MDA), *Bulletin*, no. 36 (1919); MDA, *Annual Report* (1921), 72.
13. Henry C. Grant, "Three O'Clock in the Morning," *Guide*, 17 December 1924, 1437; N. Cameron, Minister of Agriculture in 1922, used similar language in his assessment of the year: N. Cameron, "Season's Stock Taking," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* (December 1922).
14. "How may a farmer be guided in estimating the extent of future demands for farm products, so that he may have for sale those for which the most profitable prices can be obtained?"; "Discuss the Law of Supply and Demand in relation to the price of farm produce." UMA, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Agricultural Economics, 1908" and "Agricultural Economics, 1910." The MAC Papers in the University of Manitoba Archives contain annual volumes of examination papers for the years 1908 and 1925 inclusive. I surveyed all of the examination papers in the rural social sciences (agricultural economics, rural sociology, home economics, and their variants).
15. "a) Show the importance of the world's gold supply upon the general level of prices, pointing out three important qualifications to this quantity theory of money; b) Explain why practically all countries have adopted the gold standard." Ibid., Examination Papers, "Economics, 1914."
16. "What are the methods adopted by various countries for marketing grain crops? State the advantages of the North American method."; "To what extent is the 'middleman' a producer? Is there any use of talking about eliminating the middleman?"; "Discuss the middlemen and their services under the following headings: a) Whey they exist; b) Popular view concerning them; c) Helpful remedies

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for improving middleman services." Ibid., Examination Papers, "Rural Economics, 1921," "Agricultural Economics, 1923," "Principles of Marketing, 1925."

17. "a) What are the chief advantages of a good bank to any community?; b) What are the features of our Canadian banking system that safeguard holders of banknotes and depositors?" Ibid., Examination Papers, "Economics, 1912."
18. "Define capital and capital goods and wealth. How does capital originate and why do we encourage its increase?... a) Give three strong arguments in favour of trade unions; b) Give three weaknesses of trade unions." Ibid., Examination Papers, "Economics, 1920."
19. Ibid., Examination Papers, "Agronomy, 1908."
20. Ibid., MAC Calendar, 1912-14, "Farm Management Investigations," 59; MAC Calendar, 1914-15, "Farm Management," 85; MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Farm Management," 41.
21. Ibid., Examination Papers, "Farm Management, 1914."
22. Ibid., MAC Calendar, 1924-25, "Farm Management," 51-52.
23. A.H. Benton, "The Business End of Farming," *Guide*, 19 February 1919, 349; A.H. Benton, "Farm Management Surveys," *Guide*, 20 November 1918, 2438.
24. UMA, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Farm Management, 1914."
25. Ibid., MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Farm Business and Accounting."
26. Ibid., Examination Papers, "Farm Accounts, 1919."
27. Ibid., MAC Calendar, 1912-13, "The Marketing of Grain and the Factors of Price," 27; MAC Calendar, 1925-26, "Principles of Marketing," 58.
28. Ibid., Examination Papers, "Marketing of Grain, 1915."
29. Ibid., MAC Calendar, 1914-15, "Agricultural Economics," 59; MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Rural Economics," 47; MAC Calendar, 1917-18, "Rural Economics," 30; MAC Calendar, 1918-19, "Agricultural Economics," 35.
30. Ibid., MAC Calendar, 1925-26, "Principles of Cooperation," 58; Examination Papers, "Advanced Cooperative Marketing, 1925."
31. "Cooperative Marketing in Manitoba," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 80 (1925): 3, 15-16.
32. A.H. Matheson, "Home Magnetism," *MAC Gazette* 1, no. 1 (March 1908): 21-22.
33. Margaret Phillips, "Pulling Double in the Marriage Harness," *Guide*, 13 June 1923, 732.
34. Frank Middleton, "Manitoba's Community Movement in City and Country," *Managra* (November 1919): 10.
35. P. Macdonald, "The District Builders," *Guide*, 21 May 1924, 649; see also P. Macdonald, "The District Builders," *Guide*, 22 April 1925, 516 and C. Hopper, "An Agricultural Education," *Guide*, 18 February 1925, 210.
36. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1921-22, "Rural Leadership."
37. "College Man," *Managra* (February 1917): 8.
38. "President's Annual Report of MAC, 1916," *MSP*, no. 11 (1917), 637.
39. G.W. Fiske, *The Challenge of the Country* (New York: n.p., 1916), chapter 8.
40. John Gillette, *Constructive Rural Sociology* (New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1913), 195; Fiske, *Challenge of the Country*, chapter 8.
41. "Sending the College to the Country," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 8 (1916), 20.
42. T.J. Harrison, "Helping Solve Farm Problems," *Guide*, 8 March 1916, 308.
43. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1919-20, 35.
44. C. Hopper, "An Agricultural Education," *Guide*, 18 February 1925, 196, 210.
45. H.E. Walker, "Good Farming Competition," *MAC Gazette* (December 1908): 11; UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1909-10, "Department of College Extension Work."
46. Fiske, *Challenge of the Country*, 108-9 (emphasis in the original).
47. D.F. Wilson, "How Best to Overcome the Present Agricultural Depression," *TFA*, 20 January 1893, 24.
48. Frederick, *Household Engineering*, 315; M.G.R., "The Function of the Graduate in Home

Economics," *Managra* 16, no. 4 (February 1923): 10-11; Frederick, *The New Housekeeping*, 106-7.

49. UMA, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Economics of the Household, 1918" and "Economics of the Household, 1919."

50. "Protecting the Housewife," *Guide*, 10 January 1923, 47.

51. "Home Economics Societies," *Guide*, 27 February 1918, 444; "Farm Women's Congress," *MAC Gazette* 6, no. 1 (November 1912): 86; T.C. Guild, "Is Thrift Worthwhile?," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 1, no. 10 (December 1921): 7.

52. "Agricultural Fairs," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 30 (1919); "Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work," in "MDA Report," *MSP*, no. 4 (1916), 792-93; PAM, Valentine Winkler Papers, box 1, 588-94, E. Cora Hind to Valentine Winkler, 15 September 1915, re. program for women at MAC; UMA, Mary Speechly Collection, Mary Speechly, "My Interests in Practical Education."

53. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1916-17, "Poultry," 88.

54. "Financing the Farm Home," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 57 (1921), 3, 9, 11.

55. Foote Crow, *The American Country Girl*, 150; R. Whiteside, "Using System in the Home," *Guide*, 15 November 1922, 1284; Lottie Duncan, "Kitchen of Today," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 2, no. 8 (September 1922): 8.

56. Mary P. McCallum, "Making Motherhood Efficient," *Guide*, 31 October 1917, 1745; E.S. Martin, "Roland Believes in Better Babies," *Guide*, 14 June 1922, 720.

57. "From College to Matrimony," *Guide*, 3 March 1920, 493, 531.

58. "Pulling Double in the Marriage Harness," *Guide*, 13 June 1923, 732.

59. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1920-21, "Division of Home Economics," 53; see also Manitoba, Royal Commission on the Establishment of the Agricultural College (1903) and J. Cochrane Smith, "The Necessity of a Domestic Science Course," *MAC Gazette* 1, no. 1 (March 1908): 30-31.

60. H.E. Walker, "The Future of Western Agriculture," *MAC Gazette* 1, no. 8 (February 1909): 28-29; Esther Thompson, "Education for Women," *Managra* 11, no. 5 (March 1918): 16; A.H. Matheson, "Home Magnetism," *MAC Gazette* 1, no. 1 (March 1908): 21-22; UMA, MAC Papers, Examination Papers, "Home Furnishing, 1918."

61. UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1921-22, "Rural Sociology and Civics," "History of Home Life," and "Social History"; Nellie McClung, "Women's Place," *Managra* 10, no. 2 (December 1916): 7; "Summer Months with the Women's Institutes," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 1, no. 9 (November 1921).

62. "Women's Institutes," *Guide*, 16 November 1910, 20 (emphasis added); "Rural Women's Short Course" in "Home Economics Extension," MDA, *Annual Report* (1925-26), Legislative Library of Manitoba (LLM).

63. UMA, Mary Speechly Collection, clipping from *Institute News* (March 1960); PAM, MWI Papers, box 13, "Constitution for Local Home Economics Societies" in "Early Institute File"; "Home Economics Handbook," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 6 (1916); Esther Thompson, "Glimpses of Possibilities of Extension Work," *Managra* 18, no. 5 (March 1925): 35.

64. "Agricultural Societies and College Extension Work: 1915 Report," *MSP*, no. 14 (1916), 798-99; "Home Economics Extension Work," MDA, *Annual Report* (1921), LLM, 95.

65. See "Annual Report of Home Economics Societies, 1914," *MSP*, no. 13 (1915), 641; "Money Earned and Spent by the Institutes" in "Home Economics Extension," MDA, *Annual Report* (1925-26), LLM; "Manitoba Home Economics," *Guide*, 21 February 1917, 329; "Home Economics Societies," *Guide*, 27 February 1918; "1921 Convention Resolutions," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* (March 1921): 8; "Summer Months with the Women's Institutes," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* (November 1920): 8; "Twelfth Annual Convention of Manitoba Women's Institutes," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* (February 1922): 1516; "1923 Women's Institute Convention Resolutions," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 3, no. 7 (July/August 1923); D. Watt, "Presidential Address: Women's Institute Convention, June 1923," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 3, no. 7 (July/August 1923): 6.

66. Edith Charlton, "Scientific Housekeeping," *TFA*, 3 July 1907, 1023; UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1914-15, 97-98; "Home Economics Societies," *MAC Gazette* 6, no. 4 (February 1913): 297; "Better Farm Homes," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 21 (1918); Robert W. Murchie, "The Home of the Husbandman," *Guide*, 9 July 1919, 1466.
67. W.A. McIntyre, Principal of Normal School, "Report" in Manitoba Department of Education (MDE), *Annual Report* (1901), 472.
68. A.S. Rose, Brandon Division, "Inspector's Report" in MDE, *Annual Report* (1903), 587.
69. A. McIntyre, North-East Division, "Inspector's Report" in MDE, *Annual Report* (1899), 42-43; W.J. Cram, South-Central Division, "Inspector's Report" in MDE, *Annual Report* (1904), 43.
70. MDE, *Annual Report* (1907), 30; Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education, in *CSP*, no. 191d (1913), 154; Alonzo James Madill, *History of Agricultural Education in Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1937), 123-24.
71. W.A. McIntyre, "Provincial Normal School Report," MDE, *Annual Report* (1913).
72. "Boys' and Girls' Clubs," MAC, *Bulletin*, no. 15 (1916).
73. Quoted in Amy J. Roe, "Organizing Citizens of Tomorrow," *Guide*, 20 August 1919.
74. Margaret Speechly, "Anchoring Tomorrow's Women," *Guide*, 12 October 1921, 1276; Margaret Speechly, "Investments in Youth," *Guide*, 9 April 1924, 456; "Sending the College to the Country," MDA, *Bulletin*, no. 8 (1916): 17-18; Madill, *Agricultural Education in Ontario*, 123-24; Robert Fletcher, "Deputy Minister's Report" and Charles Newcombe, "Superintendent's Report" in MDE, *Annual Report* (1915); "Manitoba Boys' and Girls' Clubs," *Managra* (December 1916): 89.
75. PAM, 4-H Papers, box 4, "Junior Livestock Breeders' Week Programme, October 10-15, 1921." See also "The Extension Service," *MAC Gazette* (March 1916): 7 on study clubs for teens; "Report of Extension Service" in "MAC Reports," *MSP* (1917) on bankers in club work; S.E. Lang, "Secondary School Reports" in MDE, *Annual Report* (1913) and (1914) and "Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Enquire into and Report upon the University," *MSP* (1910), 483 on agricultural high schools; "Demonstration Teams to be Guests of Milling Companies," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* (May 1921) and PAM, 4-H Papers, box 4, "Menu, CNR Banquet for Boys' and Girls' Swine and Cattle Clubs" on the alliance between the educational and the corporate, the latter being of particular interest because it involves W.J. Black, first president of MAC, presenting the W.J. Black Trophy in his capacity as a CNR functionary; and the various "Boys' and Girls' Club" reports in the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, *Annual Reports* in the *Manitoba Sessional Papers*.
76. "Demonstration Teams," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* (February 1922): 9; PAM, 4-H Papers, box 4, "The Story of a Pleasant Trip," Manitoba Department of Agriculture Pamphlet (1921); Margaret Speechly, "Anchoring Tomorrow's Women," *Guide*, 12 October 1921, 1276. On domestic science in the schools see Margaret Speechly, "Science Puts on an Apron," *Guide*, 14 February 1923, 185; B.J. Hales, "Brandon Normal School Report," MDE, *Annual Report* (1916), 71 and (1917), 234-35; UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1912-13; Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education (1913), in *CSP*, no. 191d (1913), 143-44; Johanna Gudrun Wilson, *A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba, 1826-1966* (Winnipeg: n.p., 1969), 154-56.
77. S.E. Lang, "Inspector's Report," MDE, *Annual Report* (1903); see also "Why Educate the Farmer's Son," *TFA*, 20 August 1898, 363.
78. H.S. Maclean, "Agricultural Education," *TFA*, 20 December 1899, 639-40.
79. Roe, "Organizing Citizens of Tomorrow," 1744.
80. Fletcher, "Deputy Minister's Report," MDE, *Annual Report* (1913).
81. Ibid.
82. J. Rayner, "Agricultural Education in the Public Schools," *MAC Gazette* (February 1912): 31.
83. PAM, 4-H Papers, box 4, "Handbook: Manitoba Boys' and Girls' Clubs," February 1918.

84. Ibid., "Organization Circular, 1919"; see also "An All Year Boys' and Girls' Club," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* (June 1921): 5.

85. Charles Newcombe, "Consolidation of Schools," MDE, *Annual Report* (1909); M. Hall Jones, "Consolidation of Schools," MDE, *Annual Report* (1912); Neil Sutherland, *Children in English Canadian Society* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 193-97.

86. Margaret Speechly, "The Wingham Idea," *Guide*, 8 March 1922, 273, 278.

87. See, for example, J. Elder, "The Institute Campaign," *TFA*, 1 January 1893, 9.

88. See Lawr, "The Development of Agricultural Education," 118 on the emergence of professional agriculturalists in Ontario during the 1890s.

89. See "District Representatives" and "Agricultural Agents in Manitoba" in the *Guide*, 21 March 1923, 378, 382-83.

90. On the MAC Research Association, see UMA, MAC Papers, "Staff Minutes," 11 March 1907 and 18 March 1907. On the Canadian Society of Technical Agriculturalists, see *Managra* 14, no. 1 (November 1920): 29-30.

91. *TFA*, 20 January 1893, 24; *TFA*, 20 June 1893, 223; J. Orr, "Farming as a Specialist," *TFA*, 5 April 1893, 123.

92. See, for example, "Farmers' Institutes," *TFA*, 5 December 1895, 465.

93. See, for example, "Girls and Farm Life," *TFA*, 5 July 1893, 253; "My Dear Nieces," *TFA*, 20 May 1894, 208; "The New Woman," *TFA*, 20 May 1896, 208. For an argument that this style continued throughout the period studied here, see Norah Lewis, "Goose Grease and Turpentine: Mother Treats the Family's Illnesses," *Prairie Forum* 15, no. 1 (Spring 1990).

94. See, for example, the introductory comments to the degree program in Field Husbandry in UMA, MAC Papers, MAC Calendar, 1914-15, 185. Also see S.T. Newton's (Director of Extension) 11 June 1915 letter to Valentine Winkler, Liberal Minister of Agriculture, in which Newton defends himself against charges that he is a Conservative appointee (PAM, Valentine Winkler Papers, box 1, 261-63: "Although I have been in the employ of both parties during the past ten years I have never asked either party for a job and the work which I was asked to do was non-political in every case. I have no hesitation in assuring you that anything which I can do through the Extension Service to promote the work of the Department of Agriculture will be done, and ... that seems to be the attitude of all the people at the College."

95. See, for example, "Annual Report of Home Economics Societies, 1914," *MSP*, no. 13 (1915), 641; "Manitoba Home Economics," *Guide*, 21 February 1917, 329; "What the Agricultural Representatives are Doing," *Manitoba Agricultural Extension News* 1, no. 2 (December 1920).

96. C.C. James, "Agricultural Work in Ontario," in *Commission of Conservation* (Ottawa, 1911), 8.

Chapter 6

1. It should be stressed that in this analysis, as I argued in chapter two, identity is constituted through language and language is not simply a vehicle for the expression of identity. In this chapter I delineate a series of discourses rather than the ideas of specific individuals or social groups.

2. "Farmers' Grievances," *Manitoba Free Press*, 6 December 1883, 4; Brian McCutcheon, "The Economic and Social Structure of Political Agrarianism in Manitoba, 1870-1900" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1974), 98-115; Louis Aubrey Wood, *A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada: The Origins and Development of Agrarian Protest, 1872-1924* (1924; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 123-29.

3. McCutcheon, "Economic and Social Structure," chapter 4, chapter 5, 272.

4. McCutcheon, "Economic and Social Structure," 275-78; "Successful Farmers' Elevator Companies," *TFA*, 5 April 1898, 149.

5. Ramsay Cook, "Tillers and Toilers: The Rise and Fall of Populism in Canada in the

1890s," Canadian Historical Association, *Reports* (1984); Kealey and Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be*, 387-91; McCutcheon, "Economic and Social Structure," 279-89; Wood, *History*, 109-22; S.E.D. Shortt, "Social Change and Political Crisis in Rural Ontario: the Patrons of Industry, 1889-1896," in *Oliver Mowat's Ontario*, ed. Donald Swainson; Sidney Glazer, "The Patrons of Industry in Michigan," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 24, no. 2 (1937). During 1894 the Patrons won a provincial bye-election in Beautiful Plains constituency, while in the provincial general election of 1896 Patrons were nominated in seven constituencies and elected in two constituencies. In the federal election of 1896, meanwhile, two Patrons were nominated in Manitoba and one was nominated in the North-West Territories, but none of the three was successful. Wood, *History*, 128, 143, 145.

6. *The Patrons' Advocate* (*Advocate*), 13 March 1895.
7. Although the term "physiocratic" is often used to describe this type of popular analysis, the term itself is problematic. As a system of thought, physiocracy more accurately belongs to the history of political economy. It may have entered and influenced popular agrarian discourse, but this itself should be a subject of investigation and analysis. On the history of physiocracy, see Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *The Origins of Physiocracy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976).
8. *Advocate*, 3 October 1894. Henry Clay was the editor of *The Patrons' Advocate* from its formation in 1892 until 1895 when he was forced to resign over an editorial policy dispute with the executive board of the Patrons of Industry.
9. Ibid., 10 April 1895.
10. Ibid., 19 December 1894.
11. Ibid., 5 December 1894.
12. Ibid., 1 January 1896.
13. Ibid., 5 December 1894.
14. "Brandon Convention," ibid., 16 January 1895.
15. "Who Owns Canada?," ibid., 14 November 1894.
16. Ibid., 10 April 1895, 17 April 1895.
17. Ibid., 4 December 1894.
18. "Report from W.C. Paynter, Secretary, Beulah Patrons of Industry," ibid., 18 September 1895.
19. Ibid., 13 March 1895, 27 June 1894.
20. Ibid., 9 January 1895.
21. Ibid., 6 March 1895.
22. Ibid., 19 December 1894.
23. Ibid., 1 January 1896.
24. Ibid., 27 June 1894.
25. "Wheat Grading," ibid., 9 October 1895.
26. "Commission on the Freight Rate," ibid., 24 October 1894.
27. Ibid., 4 December 1894.
28. Brackenism refers to the nonpartisan farm-based political movement more famous for its cautious, conservative "business" approach to public issues than for its positive legislation. See John Kendle, *John Bracken: A Political Biography* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1979).
29. *Advocate*, 20 February 1895.
30. *Patrons' Sentinel* (*Sentinel*), 1 April 1896.
31. *Western Canadian*, 11 March 1899.
32. F. Howell, "What's In A Name," *Advocate*, 27 February 1895; ibid., 5 December 1893.
33. *TFA*, 5 February 1894; *Advocate*, 8 January 1896.
34. *Western Canadian*, 18 November 1897, 11 March 1899.
35. "Objections to Socialism," *Advocate*, 24 July 1895.

36. "Our Labor Party Allies," ibid., 11 December 1895.
37. Ibid., 18 December 1895; an update on the Harmony Industrial Association appeared in the *Western Canadian*, 28 July 1898. W.C. Paynter was also the secretary of the Beulah Patrons of Industry.
38. *Advocate*, July 1895.
39. "United Farmers of Manitoba President's Address," *Guide*, 16 January 1924, 60; PAM, United Farmers of Manitoba Papers (UFM), box 5, 1925 file, "Some Pertinent Facts About the UFM," 4.
40. J.S. Woodsworth, ed., *Studies in Rural Citizenship* (Winnipeg: n.p., 1914), 28; H. Moorhouse, *Deep Furrows* (Toronto and Winnipeg: Geo. J. McLeod Press, 1918), 248.
41. PAM, UFM, box 1, "For Inter-District Debate, 1923"; *The Scoop Shovel*, 1, no. 7 (January 1925). It should be stressed that I am assessing the place of the term "cooperation" (and its variations) in specific languages or discourses; I am not claiming to reveal the "true" or "real" essence of cooperation in Manitoba. Hence, my theoretical focus is different from other analyses of agrarian cooperation in which the various strains of cooperative thought are delineated and the cooperative experience is described. See, for example, Ian MacPherson, *Each for All: A History of the Cooperative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979).
42. PAM, UFM, box 15, UFM 1921 Yearbook, "President's Address," 21-23; ibid., box 15, "Canadian Financial Problems as Seen by the Organized Farmers, Joint Committee of Commerce and Agriculture, 7 March 1916," 51; see also *Guide*, 9 January 1918, 51.
43. PAM, UFM, box 1, "For Inter-District Debate, 1923"; "Manitoba Grain Growers' Association," *Guide*, 21 August 1918, 1791.
44. *Guide*, 22 July 1914, 886, 21 October 1914, 1174; "President Poole's Address," 14 January 1925, 45; Woodsworth, *Rural Citizenship*, 31-32.
45. PAM, UFM, box 18, Programs and Handbooks File, "MGGA Pamphlet, 1918"; "The Organized Farmers Educating Themselves," *Managra* 14, no. 5 (March 1921): 12.
46. PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Convention, 1904, "Proceedings and Resolutions"; box 15, MGGA Convention, 1916, "Director's Report"; box 18, Programs and Handbooks File, "MGGA Pamphlet, 1918"; box 15, MGGA Yearbook, 1918, 71.
47. PAM, UFM, box 18, "UFM Handbook of Practical Work" (1920-21).
48. PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Yearbook, 1918, 63.
49. PAM, UFM, box 15, Presidential Addresses, 1921 and 1918.
50. PAM, UFM, box 18, MGGA/UFM Pamphlets, "Let's Get It Together!"; box 15, Joint Committee on Commerce and Agriculture, 1 and 2 December 1916, "Minutes of Conference."
51. PAM, UFM, box 18, Platform File, "UFM Draft Platform, 1921"; "The Tentative Draft Platform," *Guide* 18 May 1921, 816; *Guide*, 23 August 1922, 942.
52. PAM, UFM, box 5, 1922 file, "UFM Memorandum."
53. PAM, Bracken Papers, box MG 13 I1, Addresses and Radio Talks File, 1926-44, "A Legislative Review," 2-4.
54. PAM, UFM, box 15, UFM Yearbook 1921, "Director's Report"; see also Melville H. Staples, *The Challenge of Agriculture: The Story of the United Farmers of Ontario*, (Toronto: Morang, 1921), 44 for the significant role of education in the United Farmers of Ontario, and PAM, UFM, box 1, letter from W.R. Wood to A.J.M. Poole, 10 October 1923, re. "Fundamentals of the Farmer Movement."
55. PAM, UFM, box 18, 1922-23 Pamphlets File, "Local Educational Programs"; "Education for Citizenship," *Guide*, 25 December 1918; PAM, UFM, box 15, 1922 Yearbook, "UFM Political Platform."
56. Moorhouse, *Deep Furrows*, 39-40, 58, 282, 277.
57. PAM, UFM, box 5, 1925 File, "Some Pertinent Facts About the UFM," 12; box 18, "UFM Handbook of Practical Work."
58. PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Convention, 1908, "Proceedings and Resolutions"; *Guide*, 20 April 1910, 13-14.

59. J.B. Parker, "The Farmer in Politics and Commerce," *Guide*, 31 August 1910, 10.
60. *Guide*, 12 January 1910; PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Convention, 1908, "Provincial Ownership and Operation of a System of Line Elevators."
61. *Guide*, 8 July 1914, 845; *Guide*, 21 July 1920, 1630.
62. PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Conventions, 1911, 1912, 1917, "Proceedings and Resolutions."
63. "The Grain Growers' Case," *Guide*, 27 July 1910, 78.
64. PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Convention, 1913, "President's Report"; "Wanted: Government for the People," *Guide*, 9 March 1910; "Class Legislation," *Guide*, 25 May 1910.
65. J.B. Parker, "The Farmer in Politics and Commerce," *Guide*, 31 August 1910, 10; PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Convention, 1912, "President's Address."
66. J. Kennedy, "Immediate Action Necessary," *Guide*, 30 October 1918, 2288.
67. PAM, UFM, box 12, "Farm Problem Questionnaire Reports"; also box 15, MGGA Convention, 1919, "President's Address"; "Immediate Action Necessary," *Guide*, 30 October 1918, 2288-89; "Future of Organized Labor," *Guide*, 3 September 1919, 1867.
68. *TFA*, 20 March 1897.
69. Ibid., 12 April 1905.
70. Ibid., 21 June 1897: two letters.
71. Ibid., 12 April 1905.
72. Ibid., 29 March 1905.
73. Ibid., 20 April 1897.
74. Mary P. McCallum, "Women and Special Privilege," *Guide*, 2 July 1919, 1370, 1444; PAM, Canadian Council of Agriculture (CCA) Papers, box 3, Mary P. McCallum, "Tariff Changes Hit Large Families"; "Manitoba Farm Women Convene," *Guide*, 15 January 1919, 112; "That Iniquitous Tariff," *Guide*, 14 May 1919, 1205. Mary McCallum succeeded Francis Marion Beynon as the editor of the women's section of the *Guide* in 1917. In 1921 she left the *Guide* to become assistant secretary of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. McCallum was actively involved in the prairie farm women's movement. *Guide*, 13 April 1921, 611.
75. PAM, UFM, box 5, 1920 file, "Statement Submitted to the Tariff Commission by a Member of the Executive of the UFWM, 13 October 1920." For alternative readings see Mary Kinnear, "'Do You Want Your Daughter to Marry a Farmer?'" and Sara Brooks Sundberg, "A Female Frontier: Manitoba Farm Women in 1922," *Prairie Forum* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1991).
76. PAM, UFM, box 5, 1919 file, "The Women's Section of the MGGA."
77. PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Yearbook 1919, "The MGGA and the Women's Section — Their Mutual Relationship"; "Manitoba Farm Women Convene," *Guide*, 15 January 1919, 127.
78. "Class Party, Not Sex," *Guide*, 13 November 1918, 2385; "The New Woman's Party," *Guide*, 16 October 1918, 2195; "Woman's Party Organ," *Guide*, 27 November 1918, 2478.
79. See, for example, PAM, UFM, box 5, 1925 file, "Service Rendered by the UFWM"; box 15, MGGA Yearbook 1919, "Women's Section Secretary's Report"; box 15, MGGA Convention 1918, "Constitution of Women's Section"; box 15, UFM Yearbook 1921, "UFWM — Board of Director's Report."
80. PAM, UFM, box 5, 1923 file, "UFWM President's Address to the 1923 Annual Convention"; "Mrs. Elliott's Address," *Guide*, 14 January 1925, 43.
81. "Women and the Land Problem," *Guide*, 17 July 1918, 1588.
82. PAM, UFM, box 5, "1921 UFWM Marketing Report"; 1923 file, "UFWM President's Address to the 1923 Convention."
83. *The Scoop Shovel* 1, no. 7 (January 1925).
84. "Manitoba Farm Women Organize," *Guide*, 16 January 1918, 93; PAM, UFM, box 5, 1925 file, "Services Rendered by the UFWM."

85. S. Richardson, "Community Betterment," *Guide*, 24 January 1917, 159; PAM, UFM, box 5, 1919 file, "Women's Section of the MGGA."

86. PAM, UFM, box 18, "UFM Handbook of Practical Work," 9; box 15, 1916 Convention, Mrs. J.S. Wood, "The Responsibilities and Privileges of Farmers' Wives in the Development of the Grain Growers' Movement."

87. Woodsworth, *Rural Citizenship*, 9; PAM, UFM, box 15, 1916 Convention, Mrs. W.H. English, "The Privileges and Responsibilities of Farmers' Wives."

88. "Farmers Can't Afford Comforts," *Guide*, 23 February 1916, 294; "Cooperation at Home," *Guide*, 31 December 1924, 1505; "Homes as a Socializing Force," *Guide*, 20 February 1924, 225.

89. PAM, UFM, box 15, MGGA Convention 1918, "Constitution of the Women's Section"; box 5, 1921 file, "UFWM Education Committee Report"; for a parallel prairie experience see L.J. Wilson, "Educational Role of the United Farm Women of Alberta," in *Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West*, ed. David Jones, Nancy Sheehan, and Robert Stamp (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1979).

90. PAM, UFM, box 5, "UFWM Reports on Young People's Work," 1920 and 1921.

91. Mrs. A. McGregor, "The Woman's Part," *Guide*, 5 July 1916, 1084; M. Finch, "Women and Service" and W. Wood, "Women in the New Time," *Guide*, 27 November 1918, 2450; "Wanted: A Sense of Responsibility," *Guide*, 25 April 1917, 738; "Politics and the Home," *Guide*, 30 November 1921, 1517; PAM, UFM, box 5, 1923 file, "UFWM President's Address to the 1923 Annual Convention," 1.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Manuscript Collections

Provinicial Archives of Manitoba

John Bracken Papers

Canadian Council of Agriculture Papers

4-H Papers

Manitoba Home Economics Association Papers

Manitoba Women's Institute Papers

United Farmers of Manitoba Papers

Valentine Winkler Papers

University of Manitoba Archives

Manitoba Agricultural College Papers

Mary Speechly Collection

University of Manitoba, Faculty of Agriculture Inventory

Government Documents

Canada. Commission of Conservation, "Agricultural Work in Ontario," by C.C. James (1911).

Canada. Commission of Conservation, *Reports* (1911-17).

Canada. Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education, *Report* (1913-14).

Canada. *Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1886* (1887).

Canada. *Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1896* (1897).

Canada. *Statistical Abstract and Record for the Year 1901* (1902).

Canada. *Statutes*, "The Experimental Farm Station Act" (1886).

Canada. *Statutes*, "The Agricultural Aid Act" (1912).

Canada. *Statutes*, "The Agricultural Instruction Act" (1913).

Manitoba. Manitoba Agricultural College, Bulletin Number 15, "Boys' and Girls' Clubs" (1916).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, *Reports* (1890-1925).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 6, "Home Economics Handbook" (1916).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 8, "Sending the College to the Country" (1916).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 36, "Agricultural Fairs" (1919).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 39, "Books for Farm and Home" (1919).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 57, "Financing the Farm Home" (1921).

Manitoba. Department of Agriculture, Bulletin Number 80, "Co-operative Marketing in Manitoba" (1925).

Manitoba. Department of Education, *Reports* (1890-1925).

Manitoba. Royal Commission on the Establishment of the Agricultural College, *Report* (1903).

Manitoba. Royal Commission to Enquire Into and Report Upon the University, *Report* (1910).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "The Agriculture and Immigration Act" (1872).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "The Farmers' Institutes Act" (1890).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "The Agricultural Societies Act" (1890).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "The Agriculture and Immigration Act" (1890).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "The Agricultural Societies Act" (1900).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "The Agricultural College Act" (1904).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "Home Economics Societies Act" (1910).

Manitoba. *Statutes*, "The University Amendment Act" (1924).

Newspapers And Periodicals

The Farmers' Advocate

Grain Growers' Guide

MAC Gazette/Managra

Manitoba Agricultural Extension News

Manitoba Free Press

The Patrons' Advocate

The Patrons' Sentinel

The Scoop Shovel

The Western Canadian

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

Aglietta, Michel. *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The U.S. Experience*. London: NLB, 1979.

Allen, Richard. *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Althusser, Louis. *For Marx*. London: NLB, 1969.

Anderson, Perry. *Arguments Within English Marxism*. London: Verso, 1980.

——. *Considerations On Western Marxism*. London: NLB, 1976.

——. *In the Tracks of Historical Materialism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Anstey, T.H. *One Hundred Harvests: Research Branch, Agriculture Canada, 1886-1986*. Ottawa: The Branch, 1986.

Archer Mann, Susan. *Agrarian Capitalism in Theory and Practice*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Axelrod, Paul. *Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics and the Universities of Ontario, 1945-1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Bacchi, Carol Lee. *Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

Bailey, Liberty Hyde. *The Nature Study Idea*. New York: Macmillan, 1903.

——. *The Outlook of Nature*. New York: Macmillan, 1905.

Barrett, Michelle. *Women's Oppression Today: The Marxist/Feminist Encounter*. London: Verso, 1989.

Barrow, Clyde W. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

Berger, Carl. *The Writing of Canadian History*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Bledstein, Burton. *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*. New York: Norton, 1976.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications, 1977.

Bracken, John. *Crop Production in Western Canada*. Winnipeg: Grain Growers' Guide Limited, 1920.

Britnell, George E. *The Wheat Economy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1939.

Brown, R.C. and Ramsay Cook. *Canada, 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.

Brunner, Edmund deS. *The Growth of a Science: A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States*. New York: Harper, 1957.

Buhle, Mari Jo. *Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981.

Burbank, Garin. *When Farmers Voted Red*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1976.

Burke, Peter and Roy Porter, eds. *The Social History of Language*. Vols. 1 and 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 1991.

Butler, Joan. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Buttel, Frederick H., Olaf F. Larson and Gilbert W. Gillespie, Jr. *The Sociology of Agriculture*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Butts, R. Freeman and Lawrence Cremin. *A History of Education in American Culture*. New York: Holt, 1953.

Canada Agriculture: The First One Hundred Years. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1967.

Carter, Sarah. *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990.

Carver, Thomas Nixon. *Principles of Rural Economics*. Boston: Ginn, 1911.

Chandler, Albert. *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Clark, John Bates. *The Distribution of Wealth: A Theory of Wages, Interest, and Profits*. New York: A.M. Kelley and Millman, 1924.

Cohen, Marjorie Griffin. *Women's Work, Markets, and Economic Development in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Commission on Country Life. *Report of the Commission on Country Life*. New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1911.

Comprehensive Dissertation Index. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973.

Cook, Ramsay. *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Coontz, Stephanie. *The Social Origins of Private Life: A History of American Families, 1600-1900*. London: Verso, 1988.

Cremin, Lawrence. *The Transformation of the School*. New York: Knopf, 1961.

Cubberly, Ellwood Patterson. *Rural Life and Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914.

Curtis, Bruce. *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871*. London, ON: Althouse, 1988; Sussex: Falmer, 1988.

——. *True Government by Choice Men? Inspection, Education and State Formation in Canada West*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992

Danbom, David. *"Our Purpose is to Serve": The First Century of the North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Farm*. Fargo: North Dakota Institute for Regional Studies, 1990.

Dawley, Alan. *Class and Community: The Industrial Revolution in Lynn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Dubofsky, Melvyn. *Industrialism and the American Worker, 1865-1920*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1975.

Dyson, Lowell K. *Red Harvest: The Communist Party and American Farmers*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.

Easterbrook, W.T. *Farm Credit in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1938.

Easterbrook, W.T. and Hugh J.C. Aitken. *Canadian Economic History*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1956.

Eddy, Edward Danforth, Jr. *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land Grant Idea in American Education*. New York: Harper, 1957.

Education Group II, University of Birmingham Department of Cultural Studies. *Education Limited: Schooling and Training and the New Right Since 1979*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1991.

Ellis, John H. *The Ministry of Agriculture in Manitoba, 1870-1970*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Department of Agriculture, 1970.

Ellwood, Charles A. *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*. New York: Appleton, 1910.

Ely, Richard and George Ray Wicker. *Elementary Principles of Economics*. New York: Macmillan, 1904.

Fine, Ben. *Economic Theory and Ideology*. London: E. Arnold, 1980.

Fine, Sidney. *Laissez Faire and the General Welfare State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964.

Fink, Leon. *Workingmen's Democracy: The Knights of Labor and American Politics*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1983.

Finkel, Alvin. *The Social Credit Phenomenon in Alberta*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Fiske, G.W. *The Challenge of the Country*. New York: n.p., 1912.

Fite, Gilbert. *American Farmers: The New Minority*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1981.

Fitzgerald, Deborah Kay. *The Business of Breeding: Hybrid Corn in Illinois, 1890-1940*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Foght, H.W. *The American Rural School*. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Foote Crowe, Martha. *The American Country Girl*. 1915; New York: Arno Press, 1974.

Forsey, Eugene. *A Life on the Fringe: The Memoirs of Eugene Forsey*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Fowke, Vernon C. *Canadian Agricultural Policy: The Historical Pattern*. 1946; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

——. *The National Policy and the Wheat Economy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

Fox, Bonnie, ed. *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1980.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. *Feminism Without Illusions: A Critique of Individualism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

——. *The Origins of Physiocracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Francis, R. Douglas. *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Frederick, Christine. *Household Engineering: Scientific Management in the Home*. Chicago: American Home Economics Association, 1915.

——. *The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Page, 1913.

Friesen, Gerald A. *The Canadian Prairies: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Furner, Mary O. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1975.

Gillette, John. *Constructive Rural Sociology*. New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1913.

Goodman, David, Bernardo Sorj and John Wilkinson. *From Farming to Biotechnology: A Theory of Agro-Industrial Development*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.

Goodman, David and Michael Redclift. *From Peasant to Proletarian: Capitalist Development and Agrarian Transitions*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

——. *Refashioning Nature: Food, Ecology and Culture*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Goodwin, Craufurd D.W. *Canadian Economic Thought: The Political Economy of a Developing Nation, 1814-1914*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1961.

Goodwyn, Lawrence. *Democratic Promise: The Populist Moment in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Gordon, David M., Richard Edwards and Michael Reich. *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Gordon, Linda. *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence*. New York: Penguin, 1988.

Gordon, Lynne D. *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

Green, Andy. *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the USA*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990.

Green, Francis and Bob Sutcliffe. *The Profit System: The Economics of Capitalism*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1987.

Green, James. *Grass-Roots Socialism: Radical Movements in the Southwest, 1895-1943*. Baton Rouge: University of Louisiana Press, 1978.

Grob, Gerald. *Workers and Utopia: A Study of Ideological Conflict in the American Labor Movement*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.

Hahn, Steven and Jonathan Prude, eds. *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation: Essays in the Social History of Rural America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985

Hann, Russell. *Farmers Confront Industrialism: Some Historical Perspectives on Ontario Agrarian Movements*. Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1975.

Haskell, Thomas. *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977.

Hayden, Michael. *Seeking A Balance: The University of Saskatchewan, 1907-1982*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1983.

Hiller, Harry H. *Society and Change: S.D. Clark and the Development of Canadian Sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Hollis, Patricia. *The Pauper Press: A Study in Working Class Radicalism of the 1830s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Holub, Renate. *Antonio Gramsci: Beyond Marxism and Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Houston, Susan and Alison Prentice. *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth Century Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988

Hunter, William C. *Beacon Across the Prairie: North Dakota's Land Grant College*. Fargo: North Dakota State University Press, 1961.

Iacovetta, Franca and Mariana Valverde, eds. *Gender Conflicts: New Essays in Women's History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

Isern, Thomas. *Bull Threshers and Bindlestiffs: Harvesting and Threshing on the American Plains*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1990.

Johns, Walter H. *A History of the University of Alberta, 1908-1969*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1981.

Joyce, Patrick. *Visions of the People: Industrial England and the Question of Class, 1848-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Katz, Michael, Michael Doucet and Mark Stern. *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Kealey, Gregory S. *Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Kealey, Gregory S. and Bryan D. Palmer. *Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Ontario, 1880-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Kendle, John. *John Bracken: A Political Biography*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Kett, Joseph. *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Kinnear, Mary. *Margaret McWilliams: An Interwar Feminist*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.

Kish Sklar, Kathryn. *Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973.

Kolko, Gabriel. *Main Currents in Modern American History*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso, 1985.

Laycock, David. *Populism and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Leake, Albert H. *The Means and Methods of Agricultural Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1915.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Agrarian Socialism: The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan; A Study in Political Sociology*. 1950; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Luxton, Meg. *More Than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1980.

MacDougall, John. *Rural Life in Canada: Its Trends and Tasks*. Toronto: Westminister, 1913.

MacGibbon, Duncan A. *The Canadian Grain Trade*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1932.

Mackintosh, W.A. *Economic Problems of the Prairie Provinces*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1935.

Macpherson, C.B. *Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

MacPherson, Ian. *Each for All: A History of the Co-operative Movement in English Canada, 1900-1945*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979.

Madill, Alonzo James. *History of Agricultural Education in Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1937.

Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association. *History of Manitoba Agricultural Staff, 1913-1970*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Agricultural Representatives Association, 1974.

Marx, Karl. *Capital*. Vols. 1 and 3. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954.

Matthews, Glenna. *"Just a Housewife": The Rise and Fall of Domesticity in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

McCallum, John. *Unequal Beginnings: Agriculture and Economic Development in Quebec and Ontario until 1870*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

McCormack, A. Ross. *Reformers, Rebels and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.

McMichael, Philip. *Settlers and the Agrarian Question: Foundations of Capitalism in Colonial Australia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Metcalfe, Alan. *Canada Learns to Play: The Emergence of Organized Sport, 1807-1914*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1987.

Miliband, Ralph. *Marxism and Politics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

——. *The State in Capitalist Society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.

Miller, J.C. *Rural Schools in Canada: Their Organization, Administration and Supervision*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1913.

Montgomery, David. *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1867-1872*. New York: Knopf, 1967.

——. *The Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865-1925*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Moorhouse, Hopkins. *Deep Furrows*. Toronto: Geo. J. McLeod Press, 1918.

Morera, Esteve. *Gramsci's Historicism: A Realist Interpretation*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Morlan, Robert. *Political Prairie Fire: The Nonpartisan League, 1915-22*. 1955; St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1985.

Morton, Arthur S. *Saskatchewan: The Making of a University*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.

Morton, W.L. *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba, 1877-1952*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

——. *The Progressive Party in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

Murchie, Robert W. *Agricultural Progress on the Prairie Frontier*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1936.

Murchie, Robert W. and Henry C. Grant. *Unused Lands of Manitoba*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Immigration, 1926.

Naylor, James. *The New Democracy: Challenging the Social Order in Industrial Ontario, 1914-25*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Naylor, R.T. *The History of Canadian Business*. 2 vols. Toronto: Lorimer, 1975.

Nelson, Lowry. *Rural Sociology: Its Origins and Growth in the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.

Noble, David. *America By Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. New York: Knopf, 1977.

Owram, Doug. *The Government Generation: Canadian Intellectuals and the State, 1900-1945*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Palmer, Bruce. *Man Over Money: The Southern Populist Critique of American Capitalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

Palmer, Bryan D. *Descent into Discourse: The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

——. *Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1992.

Panitch, Leo, ed. *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.

Patton, Harald S. *Grain Growers' Co-operation in Western Canada*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Penner, Norman. *The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis*. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Pentland, H.C. *Labour and Capital in Canada, 1650-1850*. Toronto: Lorimer, 1981.

Pessen, Edward. *Most Uncommon Jacksonians: The Radical Leaders of the Early Labor Movement*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1967.

Pollack, Norman. *The Populist Response to Industrial America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

——, ed. *The Populist Mind*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.

Prentice, Alison. *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada*. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1977.

Reck, Franklin M. *The 4-H Story: A History of 4-H Club Work*. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1951.

Richards, Ellen Henrietta. *The Cost of Food*. New York: Wiley, 1901.

——. *The Cost of Living*. New York: Wiley, 1899.

——. *The Cost of Shelter*. New York: Wiley, 1905.

Richards, John and Larry Pratt. *Prairie Capitalism: Power and Influence in the New West*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979.

Riley, Denise. *Am I That Name? Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History*. London: Macmillan, 1988.

Roll of Ipsden, Eric Roll, Baron. *A History of Economic Thought*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1956.

Rosenau, Pauline. *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Rowles, Edith Child. *Home Economics in Canada: The Early History of Six College Programs: Prologue to Change*. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan, 1966.

Ryerson, Stanley. *Unequal Union: Confederation and the Roots of Conflict in the Canadas, 1815-1873*. Toronto: Progress Publishers, 1975.

Saloutos, Theodore and John Hicks. *Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West, 1900-1939*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951.

Sangster, Joan. *Dreams of Equality: Women on the Canadian Left, 1920-1950*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989.

Schwartz Cowan, Ruth. *More Work For Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Schwendinger, Herman and Julie Schwendinger. *The Sociologists of the Chair*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Scott, Joan. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Scott, Roy. *The Reluctant Farmer: The Rise of Agricultural Extension to 1914*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

Seccombe, Wally. *A Millennium of Family Change: Feudalism to Capitalism in Northwestern Europe*. London: Verso, 1992.

Shore, Marlene. *The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origin of Social Research in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Shortt, S.E.D. *The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian Intellectuals and Their Convictions in an Age of Transition, 1890-1930*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Shover, John L. *First Majority, Last Minority: The Transforming of Rural Life in America*. DeKalb, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1976.

Snell, John Ferguson. *Macdonald College of McGill University: A History from 1904 to 1955*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1963.

Speechly, H.M. *A Story of the Women's Institutes of Manitoba, 1910-1934*. Winnipeg: n.p., 1934.

Staples, Melville H. *The Challenge of Agriculture*. Toronto: Morang, 1921.

Strasser, Susan. *Never Done: A History of American Housework*. New York: Pantheon, 1982.

Strong-Boag, Veronica. *The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939*. Toronto: Copp Clark Pittman, 1988.

Sutherland, Neil. *Children in English Canadian Society, 1880-1920*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Swan River: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life. Winnipeg: Departments of Social Service and Evangelism of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, 1914.

Taylor, Barbara. *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Virago, 1983.

Taylor, Henry C. *An Introduction to the Study of Agricultural Economics*. New York: Macmillan, 1905.

——. *Principles of Agricultural Economics*. New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Taylor, Henry C. and Anne Taylor. *The Story of Agricultural Economics in the United States, 1840-1932*. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1952.

Therborn, Goran. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. London: Verso, 1980.

——. *Science, Class and Society*. London: NLB, 1976.

Thompson, E.P. *Customs in Common*. London: Merlin Press, 1992.

——. *The Poverty of Theory*. London: Merlin Press, 1978.

Thompson, John Herd. *The Harvests of War: The Prairie West, 1914-1918*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.

Thompson, John Herd with Allan Seager. *Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1985.

Tribe, Keith. *Land, Labour and Economic Discourse*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

True, Alfred Charles. *A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-1925*. Washington: Arno Press, 1929.

Turtle Mountain: Survey of Educational, Social and Religious Life. Winnipeg: Departments of Social Service and Evangelism of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, 1914.

Valverde, Mariana. *The Age of Light, Soap and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1991.

Veysey, Lawrence. *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Vogel, Lise. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983.

Voisey, Paul. *Vulcan: The Making of a Prairie Community*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988

Warren, George F. *Farm Management*. Cornell, NY: Cornell University Press, 1911.

Whatmore, Sarah. *Farming Women: Gender, Work and Family Enterprise*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1990.

Wheeler, Seager. *Seager Wheeler's Book on Profitable Grain Growing*. Winnipeg: Grain Growers' Guide Limited, 1919.

Wilson, Johanna Gudrun. *A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba, 1826-1966*. Winnipeg: n.p., 1969.

Wood, Louis Aubrey. *A History of the Farmers' Movements in Canada: The Origins and Development of Agrarian Protest, 1872-1924*. 1924; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Woodsworth, J.S., ed. *Studies in Rural Citizenship*. Winnipeg: n.p., 1914.

Journal Articles, Book Chapters and Unpublished Papers

Adelman, Jeremy. "Prairie Farm Debt and the Financial Crisis of 1914." *Canadian Historical Review* 71, no. 4 (December 1990): 491-519.

——. "The Social Basis of Technical Change: Mechanization of the Wheatlands of Argentina and Canada, 1890-1914." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34, no. 2 (April 1992): 271-300.

Allen, Judith. "Contextualising Late-Nineteenth-Century Feminism: Problems and Comparisons." *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* (1990): 17-36.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: NLB, 1971.

Brady, Marilyn. "Populism and Feminism in a Newspaper by and for Women of the Kansas Farmers' Alliance." *Kansas History* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1984/85): 280-90.

Brenner, Robert and Mark Glick. "The Regulation Approach: Theory and History." *New Left Review* 188 (July/August 1991): 45-119.

Brooks Sundberg, Sara. "A Female Frontier: Manitoba Farm Women in 1922." *Prairie Forum* 16, no. 2 (Fall 1991): 185-204.

Beito, G. "'I am a Farmer's Wife, not a Farmerette': Letters to the Nonpartisan Leader, 1917-1920." In *Plainswoman: An Anthology of Rural Women, March 1981-April 1983* (Grands Forks: University of North Dakota Press, 1983).

Cavanaugh, Catherine. "The Limitations of the Pioneering Partnership: The Alberta Campaign for Homestead Dower, 1909-25." *Canadian Historical Review* 74, no. 2 (June 1993): 198-225.

Chevalier, Jacques. "There is Nothing Simple About Simple Commodity Production." *Studies in Political Economy* 7 (Winter 1982): 89-124.

Conway, J.F. "Populism in the United States, Russia, and Canada: Explaining the Roots of Canada's Third Parties." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 11, no. 1 (1978): 99-124.

——. "The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy: Some Reconsiderations." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1979): 77-91.

Cook, Ramsay. "Francis Marion Beynon and the Crisis of Christian Reformism." In *The West and the Nation: Essays in Honour of W.L. Morton*, edited by Carl Berger and Ramsay Cook. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.

——. "Tillers and Toilers: The Rise and Fall of Populism in Canada in the 1890s." Canadian Historical Association *Reports* (1984): 3-20.

Crowley, Terry. "Madonnas Before Magdalenes: Adelaide Hoodless and the Making of the Canadian Gibson Girl." *Canadian Historical Review* 67, no. 4 (December 1986): 520-47.

Danylewycz, Marta, Beth Light and Alison Prentice. "The Evolution of the Sexual Division of Labour in Teaching: A Nineteenth Century Ontario and Quebec Case Study." *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 16, no. 31 (May 1983): 81-109.

Danylewycz, Marta and Alison Prentice "Teacher's Work: Changing Patterns and Perceptions in the Emerging School Systems of Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Central Canada." *Labour/Le Travail* 17 (Spring 1986): 59-80.

Davis, Angela. "'Valiant Servants': Women and Technology on the Canadian Prairies, 1910-1940." *Manitoba History* 25 (Spring 1993): 33-42.

Davis, Mike. "'Fordism' in Crisis: A Review of Michel Aglietta's *Regulation et crises: L'experience des Etats Unis*." *Review* 2 (Fall 1978): 207-69.

Decarie, Graeme. "Something Old, Something New. ...: Aspects of Prohibitionism in Ontario in the 1890s." In *Oliver Mowat's Ontario*, edited by Donald Swainson. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1972.

Dentith, Simon. "Political Economy, Fiction and the Language of Practical Ideology in Nineteenth Century England." *Social History* 8, no. 2 (May 1983): 183-99.

Destler, Chester. "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901: Concepts and Origins." In Chester Destler, *American Radicalism, 1865-1901*. 1946; New York: Octagon Books, 1963.

Dortman, J. "The Role of the German Historical School in American Economic Thought." *American Economic Review (Papers and Proceedings)* 45, no. 2 (May 1955): 17-28.

Duncan, Otis Durant. "Rural Sociology Coming of Age." *Rural Sociology* 19, no. 1 (March 1954): 1-12.

Finkel, Alvin. "Populism and Gender: The UFA and Social Credit Experiences." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27, no. 4 (Winter 1992/93): 76-97.

Forbes, Ernest. "A Review Article on Carol Lee Bacchi's *Liberation Deferred? The Ideas of the English Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918*." *Atlantis* 10, no. 2 (Spring 1985): 119-26.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "The Ideological Bases of Domestic Economy." In Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *The Fruits of Merchant Capital*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

——. "Socialist-Feminist American Women's History: A Review Essay." *Journal of Women's History* 1, no. 3 (Winter 1990): 181-210.

Friedmann, Harriet. "The Family Farm and the International Food Regimes." In *Peasants and Peasant Societies*, edited by Teodor Shanin. London: Basil Blackwell, 1987.

——. "Household Production and the National Economy: Concepts for the Analysis of Agrarian Formations." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 7, no. 2 (January 1980): 158-84.

——. "Simple Commodity Production and Wage Labour in the American Plains." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 6, no. 1 (October 1978): 71-100.

——. "World Market, State, and Family Farm: Social Basis of Household Production in the Era of Wage Labour." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 20, no. 4 (October 1978): 545-86.

Friedmann, Harriet and Philip McMichael "Agriculture and the State System: The Rise and Decline of National Agricultures, 1870 to the Present." *Sociologia Ruralis* 29, no. 2 (1989): 93-117.

Friesen, Gerald. "'Yours in Revolt': Regionalism, Socialism and the Western Canadian Labour Movement." *Labour/Le Travailleur* 1 (1976): 139-57.

Gidney, R.D. and D.A. Lawr. "Bureaucracy vs. Community?: The Origins of Bureaucratic Procedure in the Upper Canadian School System." *Journal of Social History* 13, no. 3 (1980): 438-57.

Gillette, John. "Nature of the Rural Social Problem." *Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota* 2 (April 1912).

Glazer, Sidney. "The Patrons of Industry in Michigan." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 24, no. 2 (1937): 185-94.

Goodwin, Craufurd D.W. "Marginalism Moves to the New World." In *The Marginal Revolution in Economics: Interpretation and Evaluation*, edited by R.D. Collision Black, A.W. Coats and Craufurd D.W. Goodwin. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1973.

Gorham, Deborah. "Flora McDonald Denison: Canadian Feminist." In *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada, 1880s-1920s*, edited by Linda Kealey. Toronto: Women's Press, 1979.

Goss, K.F., R.D. Rodefeld and Frederick H. Buttel. "The Political Economy of Class Structure in U.S. Agriculture: A Theoretical Outline." In *The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Frederick H. Buttel and Howard Newby. Montclair, NJ: Allanheld Osmun, 1980.

Grant, Henry C. Review of *The Canadian Grain Trade*, by D.A. MacGibbon. *Journal of Farm Economics* 14, no. 4 (October 1932): 702-5.

Gray, Robert. "The Deconstructing of the English Working Class." *Social History* 11, no. 3 (October 1986): 363-73.

——. "The Languages of Factory Reform in Britain, c. 1830-1860." In *The Historical Meanings of Work*, edited by Patrick Joyce. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Hall, Stuart. "Schooling, State and Society." In *Education and the State, Volume I: Schooling and the National Interest*, edited by Roger Dale. Lewes, England: Falmer Press, 1981.

Hann, Russell. "Brainworkers and the Knights of Labor: E.E. Sheppard, Phillips Thompson, and the *Toronto News*, 1883-1887." In *Essays in Canadian Working Class History*, edited by Gregory S. Kealey and Peter Warrian. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976.

Hedley, Max J. "Independent Commodity Production and the Dynamics of Tradition." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 13, no. 4 (November 1976): 413-21.

——. "Relations of Production of the 'Family Farm': Canadian Prairies." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 9, no. 1 (October 1981): 71-85.

——. "Reproduction and Evolving Patterns of Co-operation and Resource Transfer Among Domestic Producers." *Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 1, no. 2 (Winter 1980): 141-47.

Heron, Craig. "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class." *Labour/Le Travail* 13 (Spring 1984): 45-76.

Heron, Craig and Robert Storey. "On the Job in Canada." In *On the Job: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada*, edited by Craig Heron and Robert Storey. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986.

——. "Work and Struggle in the Canadian Steel Industry, 1900-1950." In *On the Job: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada*, edited by Craig Heron and Robert Storey. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986.

Holmes, C.L. "Farm Management." *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 6: 111-14. New York: Macmillan, 1931.

Jenkins, William D. "Housewifery and Motherhood: The Question of Role Change in the Progressive Era." In *Woman's Being, Woman's Place: Female Identity and Vocation in American History*, edited by Mary Kelley. Boston: Hall, 1979.

Jones, David. "An Exceedingly Risky and Unremunerative Partnership: Farmers and the Financial Interests Amid the Collapse of Southern Alberta." In *Building Beyond the Homestead: Rural History on the Prairies*, edited by David Jones and Ian MacPherson. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1985.

Joyce, Patrick. "The Historical Meanings of Work: An Introduction." In *The Historical Meanings of Work*, edited by Patrick Joyce. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Kealey, Gregory S. "The Structure of Canadian Working Class History." In *Lectures in Canadian Labour and Working Class History*, edited by W.J.C. Cherwinski and Gregory S. Kealey. St. John's, NF: Committee on Canadian Labour History, 1985.

Kealey, Linda. "Canadian Socialism and the Woman Question, 1900-1914." *Labour/Le Travail* 13 (Spring 1984): 77-100.

——. "Women in the Canadian Socialist Movement, 1904-1914." In *Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics*, edited by Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Kechnie, Margaret. "The United Farm Women of Ontario: Developing a Political Consciousness." *Ontario History* 77, no. 4 (December 1985): 267-80.

Kinnear, Mary. "'Do You Want Your Daughter to Marry a Farmer?': Women's Work on the Farm, 1922." In *Canadian Papers in Rural History*, vol. 6, edited by Donald H. Akenson. Gananoque, ON: Langdale Press, 1988.

Klein, Alice and Wayne Roberts. "Besieged Innocence: The 'Problem' and Problems of Working Women — Toronto, 1896-1914." In *Women at Work, 1850-1930*, edited by Janice Acton, Penny Goldsmith and Bonnie Shepard. Toronto: Women's Press, 1974.

Laclau, Ernesto. "Populist Rupture and Discourse." *Screen Education* 34 (Spring 1980).

——. "Towards a Theory of Populism." In Ernesto Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory*. London: NLB, 1979.

Lazonick, William. "Class Relations and the Capitalist Enterprise: A Critical Assessment of Marxian Economic Theory." Unpublished paper, Harvard University, 1983.

Lecourt, Dominique. "On Archaeology and Knowledge." In Dominique Lecourt, *Marxism and Epistemology*. London: NLB, 1975.

Lewis, Norah. "Goose Grease and Turpentine: Mother Treats the Family's Illnesses." *Prairie Forum* 15, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 67-84.

Loewen, Royden. "'The Children, the Cows, My Dear Man and My Sister': The Transplanted Lives of Mennonite Farm Women, 1874-1900." *Canadian Historical Review* 73, no. 3 (September 1992): 344-73.

——. "Ethnic Farmers and the 'Outside' World: Mennonites in Manitoba and Nebraska, 1874-1900." *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* (1990): 195-213.

MacPherson, Ian and John Thompson. "The Business of Agriculture: Prairie Farmers and the Adoption of 'Business Methods'." In *Canadian Papers in Business History*, vol. 1, edited by Peter Baskerville. Victoria: Public History Group, University of Victoria, 1989.

Mahood, Sally. "The Women's Suffrage Movement in Canada and Saskatchewan." In *Women Unite! An Anthology of the Canadian Women's Movement*, edited by Janice Acton et al. Toronto: Canadian Women's Educational Press, 1972.

Mavor, James. "Agricultural Development in the North-West of Canada, 1905-1909." *Report of the 79th Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*. London: n.p., 1910: 209-30.

McDean, Harry C. "Professionalism in the Rural Social Sciences, 1896-1919." *Agricultural History* 58, no. 3 (1984): 373-92.

——. "Professionalism, Policy and Farm Economists in the Early Bureau of Agricultural Economics." *Agricultural History* 57, no. 1 (1983): 64-82.

McKillop, A.B. "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto." In A.B. McKillop, *Contours of Canadian Thought*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

McMichael, Philip. "State Formation and the Construction of a World Market." In *Political Power and Social Theory*, edited by Maurice Zeitlin. Greenwood: JAI Press, 1987.

Menzies, June. "Votes for Saskatchewan Women." In *Politics in Saskatchewan*, edited by Norman Ward and D.S. Spafford. Toronto: Longmans, 1968.

Miller, Sally. "Kate Richards O'Hare: Progression toward Feminism." *Kansas History* 7, no. 4 (Winter 1984/85): 263-79.

Mitchinson, Wendy. "The WCTU: 'For God, Home and Native Land': A Study of Nineteenth Century Feminism." In *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada, 1880s-1920s*, edited by Linda Kealey. Toronto: Women's Press, 1979.

Monod, David. "Rethinking Prairie Communism." *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 18, no. 35 (May 1985): 99-118.

Montgomery, David. "Labor and the Republic in Industrial America, 1860-1920." *Mouvement social* 111 (avril/juin 1980): 201-15.

Murray, Stanley M. "James B. Power: The Second President of North Dakota Agricultural College." *North Dakota Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (Autumn 1974): 5-25.

Nelson, Lowry. "Constructing Rural Sociology." *Rural Sociology* 9, no. 3 (September 1944): 219-25.

——. "The Rise of Rural Sociology: The Pre-Purnell Period." *Rural Sociology* 30, no. 4 (December 1965): 407-27.

Newton, Janice. "The Alchemy of Politicization: Socialist Women and the Early Canadian Left." In *Gender Conflicts: New Essays in Women's History*, edited by France Iacovetta and Mariana Valverde. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

Nourse, E.G. "Agricultural Economics — United States." *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 1: 534-36. New York: Macmillan, 1930.

Oberschall, Anthony. "The Institutionalization of American Sociology." In *The Establishment of Empirical Sociology: Studies in Continuity, Discontinuity, and Institutionalization*, edited by Anthony Oberschall. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Phillips, Paul. "The Hinterland Perspective: The Political Economy of Vernon Fowke." *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1978): 73-96.

——. "Manitoba in the Agrarian Period, 1870-1940." In *The Political Economy of Manitoba*, edited by Jim Silver and Jeremy Hull. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, 1990.

——. "Staples, Surplus and Exchange: The Commercial-Industrial Question in the National Policy Period." In *Explorations in Canadian Economic History: Essays in Honour of Irene M. Spry*, edited by Duncan Cameron. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1985.

Pitsula, James. "The Emergence of Social Work in Toronto." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 14, no. 1 (Spring 1979): 35-58.

Post, Charles. "The American Road to Capitalism." *New Left Review* 133 (May/June 1982): 30-51.

Regehr, T.D. "Bankers and Farmers in Western Canada, 1900-1939." In *The Developing West: Essays on Canadian History in Honour of Lewis H. Thomas*, edited by John E. Foster. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1983.

Roberts, Wayne. "'Rocking the Cradle for the World': The New Woman and Maternal Feminism, Toronto 1877-1914." In *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada, 1880s-1920s*, edited by Linda Kealey. Toronto: Women's Press, 1979.

Roome, Patricia. "Amelia Turner and Calgary Labour Women, 1919-1935." In *Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics*, edited by Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Rossiter, Margaret. "The Organization of the Agricultural Sciences." In *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920*, edited by Alexandra Oleson and John Voss. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Rowthorn, Bob. "Neo-Classicism, Neo-Ricardianism and Marxism." *New Left Review* 86 (July/August 1974): 63-87.

Seccombe, Wally. "The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism." *New Left Review* 83 (1974): 3-24.

Sheehan, Nancy. "The WCTU and Educational Strategies on the Canadian Prairies." In *Schools in the West: Essays in Canadian Educational History*, edited by Nancy Sheehan and David Jones. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986.

Shortt, S.E.D. "Social Change and Political Crisis in Rural Ontario: The Patrons of Industry, 1889-1896." In *Oliver Mowat's Ontario*, edited by Donald Swainson. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1972.

Sinclair, Peter. "Class Structure and Populist Protest: The Case of Western Canada." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1975): 1-17.

Spafford, D.S. "The Left-Wing, 1921-1931." In *Politics in Saskatchewan*, edited by Norman Ward and D.S. Spafford. Toronto: Longmans, 1968.

——. "The Origins of the Farmers' Union of Canada." In *Historical Essays on the Prairie Provinces*, edited by Donald Swainson. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M. "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 65, no. 1 (January 1990): 59-86.

Spillman, W.J. "The Farmer's Income." In *Selected Readings in Rural Economics*, edited by Thomas Nixon Carver. New York: Ginn, 1916.

Stamp, Robert. "Teaching Girls Their 'God Given Place in Life': The Introduction of Home Economics in the Schools." *Atlantis* 2, no. 2, part I (Spring 1977): 18-34.

——. "Vocational Objectives in Canadian Education: An Historical Overview." In *Canadian Higher Education in the Seventies*, edited by Sylvia Ostry. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972.

Stedman Jones, Gareth. "Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution." In Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

——. "Rethinking Chartism." In Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History, 1832-1982*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Steedman, Carolyn. "'The Mother Made Conscious': The Historical Development of a Primary School Pedagogy." *History Workshop Journal* 20 (Autumn 1985): 151-63.

Strong-Boag, Veronica. "Ever a Crusader: Nellie McClung: First Wave Feminist." In *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*, edited by Veronica Strong-Boag and Anita Fellman. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1986.

——. "Intruders in the Nursery: Childcare Professionals Reshape the Years One to Five." In *Childhood and Family in Canadian History*, edited by Joy Parr. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.

——. "Keeping House in God's Country: Canadian Women at Work in the Home." In *On the Job: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada*, edited by Craig Heron and Robert Storey. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986.

——. "Pulling in Double Harness or Hauling a Double Load: Women, Work and

Feminism on the Canadian Prairie." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 21, no. 3 (Autumn 1986): 32-52.

Swierenga, Robert P. "Theoretical Perspectives on the New Rural History: From Environmentalism to Modernization." *Agricultural History* 56, no. 3 (January 1982): 495-502.

Taylor, Henry C. Review of *Principles of Rural Economics*, by Thomas Nixon Carver. *American Economic Review* 2, no. 3 (September 1912): 620-24.

Thomson, E.H. "Profits That Farmers Receive." In *Selected Readings in Rural Economics*, edited by Thomas Nixon Carver. New York: Ginn, 1916.

Warren, G.F. "The Origin and Development of Farm Economics in the United States." *Journal of Farm Economics* 14, no. 1 (January 1932): 2-9.

Wilentz, Sean. "Against Exceptionalism: Class Consciousness and the American Labor Movement, 1790-1920." *International Labor and Working Class History* 26 (Fall 1984): 1-24.

Wilson, L.J. "Educational Role of the United Farm Women of Alberta." In *Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West*, edited by David Jones, Nancy Sheehan and Robert Stamp. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1979.

Wolpe, AnnMarie. "The Official Ideology of Education for Girls." In *Education and the State, Volume II: Politics, Patriarchy and Practice*, edited by Roger Dale et al. Lewes, England: Falmer Press, 1981.

Wrigley, Emma Seifrit. "It Might Have Been Euthenics: The Lake Placid Conferences and the Home Economics Movement." *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 79-96.

Theses And Dissertations

Conway, John. "'To Seek A Goodly Heritage': The Prairie Populist Resistance to the National Policy." Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University, 1979.

Friedmann, Harriet. "The Transformation of Wheat Production in the Era of the World Market: A Global Analysis of Production and Exchange." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976.

Houston, Susan. "The Impetus to Reform: Urban Crime, Poverty, and Ignorance in Ontario, 1850-1875." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1974.

Jones, David. "Agriculture, the Land, and Education: British Columbia, 1914-1929." Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978.

Lawr, Douglas. "The Development of Agricultural Education in Ontario, 1870-1910." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972.

McCutcheon, Brian. "The Economic and Social Structure of Political Agrarianism in Manitoba, 1870-1900." Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1974.

Nesmith, Thomas. "The Philosophy of Agriculture: The Promise of the Intellect in Ontario Farming, 1835-1914." Ph.D. dissertation, Carleton University, 1988.

Panting, Gerald. "A Study of the United Farmers of Manitoba to 1928: An Agricultural Association During a Period of Transition." MA thesis, University of Manitoba, 1954.

Putman, James. "The Socialist Party of North Dakota, 1902-1918." Master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1956.

Seccombe, Wally. "The Reproduction of Labour Power: A Comparative Study." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto (OISE), 1983.

Taylor, Jeffery M. "Dominant and Popular Ideologies in the Making of Rural Manitobans, 1890-1925." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manitoba, 1988.

Wilson, Keith. "The Development of Education in Manitoba." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Fashioning Farmers

Ideology, Agricultural Knowledge and the Manitoba Farm Movement, 1890-1925

Jeffery Taylor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE